

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS



Not for sale
For use in library only

VOLUME ONE

1956-1957

WESTON COLLEGE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
WESTON 93, MASSACHUSETTS

NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS

VOLUME 1

WINTER 1956-1957

NUMBER 2

Editor

J. J. COLLINS

Prof. New Testament

Associate Editors

B. C. CONNOLLY

Librarian

J. J. WALSH

Prof. Dogmatic Theology

Managing Editor

J. J. McGRATH

Business Manager

W. C. McINNES

Assistant Editors

J. F. BARRY

R. J. CHENEY

J. G. CORNELLIER

J. T. HAMEL

H. J. MURPHY

J. W. O'NEIL

A. F. REDDY

R. E. VARNERIN

J. P. WALSH

Business Staff

J. J. DONOHUE

J. H. DUGGAN

J. M. MURPHY

W. M. SHEA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Abstractors, Staff	86
Abbreviations, Sigla	86
PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS	
Inspiration, Texts, Versions, Canon	87
Gospels (General)	89
Synoptic Gospels	92
Gospel of St. John	96
Characters of the Gospels	99
Acts of the Apostles	104
Epistles of St. Paul	106
Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse	112
Biblical Theology	113
Archaeology	127
Dead Sea Scrolls	129
Intertestamental Studies, Rabbinical Literature, Apocrypha	136
BOOKS AND OPINIONS	
Dead Sea Scrolls	139
Two Volumes of Studies	142
Textual Criticism	147
NT Theology: Love and Conscience	151
The Synoptic Problem	152
Atlas, Lexicon, History	154
<i>Sensus Plenior</i>	156
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	158
Books Received	159
New Abstractors	160
Index of Scripture Texts	161
Index of Proper Names	162

An abstract is an objective summary of an article or review. The contents of an abstract therefore, are not necessarily the opinions of the editors of NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS; the views offered on disputed biblical questions remain the opinions of the original authors. Most of the articles and reviews abstracted in this issue appeared between July 1956 and December 1956.

Copyright, 1957, by Weston College

LIST OF ABSTRACTORS, STAFF, ABBREVIATIONS, SIGLA

LIST OF ABSTRACTORS

Unless otherwise indicated, abstractors are members of Weston College, theologate of the Jesuit Province of New England.

Abbott (WMA) Lect. Greek Lit. and Philos.; *Alcina* (FA); *Allen* (FRA); *Barbin*, S.J. (Bb) L'Immaculée-Conception, Montréal; *Barry* (JFB); *Bennett* (JTB); *Brennan* (JFBn); *Bresnahan* (JFBr); *Burke* (WJB); *Campbell* (RBC); *Cheney* (RC); *Coleman*, S.J. (JFC) Woodstock College, Md.; *Collins* (JJC) Prof. New Testament and Biblical Greek; *Cornellier* (JGC); *Cote* (RJC); *Cowburn*, S.J. (JFCb) Jesuitenkolleg, Innsbruck; *Curran*, S.J. (DJC) Jesuitenkolleg, Innsbruck; *Decker* (NFD); *Demske*, S.J. (JMD) Jesuitenkolleg, Innsbruck; *Devine* (WGD); *Donohoe* (JAD); *Doyle* (PD) Upholland College, Wigan, Lancs.; *Dulles*, S.J. (ARD) Woodstock College, Md.; *Dunn* (RVD) Lect. Hebrew Lang. and Lit.; *Feeney* (WJF); *Foley* (DJF); *Foley*, S.J. (JFF) Jesuitenkolleg, Innsbruck; *Fortin*, S.J. (AF) L'Immaculée-Conception, Montréal; *German* (GGm); *Graystone*, S.M. (GG) Prof. Sacred Scripture and Moral Theology St. Mary's Hill, Paignton, S. Devon. Eng.; *Harrigan* (PKH); *Harvey*, S.J. (JH) L'Immaculée-Conception, Montréal; *Hernandez* (EH); *Ibach* (WDI); *Jarski* (JCJ); *Johnson* (TAJ); *Jolson* (AJJ); *Kelly* (KK) Upholland College, Wigan, Lancs.; *Kerdiejus* (JBK); *Laughlin* (JRL); *Loftus*, S.J. (RLL) Jesuitenkolleg, Innsbruck; *MacRae*, S.J. (GWM) Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore; *Martin* (LM); *McEvoy* (JAMcE) Prof. Fundamental Theology; *McGrath* (JJM); *Medrano* (LMd); *Monks* (JLM) Prof. Dogmatic Theology and History of Liturgy; *Moriarty* (FLM) Dean of Theology—Prof. Old Testament and Hebrew; *Murphy* (HM); *North*, S.J. (RN) Pont. Bibl. Inst. Jerusalem; *O'Connor* (JEO'C); *O'Neil* (JO'N); *O'Rourke* (JO'R) Prof. New Testament St. Charles Seminary Overbrook, Philadelphia; *O'Toole* (LJO'T); *Powers* (HRP); *Read* (WJR) Prof. Dogmatic Theology; *Ryan* (FJR); *Stanley*, S.J. (DMS) Prof. New Testament—Jesuit Theologate, Toronto; *Su* (SSS); *Twomey* (RLT) Lect. Hebrew Lang.; *Varnerin* (REV); *Verreault*, S.J. (FV) L'Immaculée-Conception, Montréal; *Walsh* (JPW); *Zewe* (MDZ).

Editorial Assistants

E. X. Canning	J. A. Donohoe	G. L. McLaughlin	L. M. St. Onge
R. J. Cote	D. D. Lynch	J. A. Paquet	J. T. Sheehan

Cover

Cover design by L. Skelly and R. Campbell. The cross and globe which surmount the dome of Weston College have been adopted as the NTA Symbol. Encircling the globe is the traditional symbolic representation of the four Evangelists.

ABBREVIATIONS

Well-known theological sources, handbooks, and collections are cited by initials only, in italics, without periods, e.g., *PG* and *PL* for Migne's collections, *DB* for Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, *DTC* for *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, etc. But the following abbreviations, without periods, are not italicized in NEW TESTAMENT ABSTRACTS:

DV	Douay Version	NT	New Testament
KJV	King James Version	OT	Old Testament
LXX	Septuagint	RSV	Revised Standard Version
MT	Massoretic Text	SS	Sacred Scripture

SIGLA

r indicates abstract of a book review

* indicates a non-Catholic author or publication

PERIODICAL ABSTRACTS

INSPIRATION, TEXTS, VERSIONS, CANON

174. P. BENOIT, "Note complémentaire sur l'Inspiration," *RB* 63 ('56) 416-422.

Replies to observations of J. Coppens in *ETL* 31 ('55) 671-673. B denies holding that the solemn declaration of *Providentissimus* on the nature of inspiration was imperfect. Leo XIII taught the essentials of inspiration and left to theologians the task of settling finer points. The Church, in this case, took care not to incorporate in its official declaration the personal solution of Franzelin. B distinguishes inspiration and revelation, admits there can be inspiration without revelation but certainly does not rule out revelation in Scripture.

When are we sure the author is making an affirmation guaranteed by the charism of inerrancy? The subject matter treated cannot be decisive; the intention of the author, often discerned with difficulty, is the only satisfactory criterion. To determine that intention is the exegete's task. However, since God speaks in each book, giving the Bible an over-all unity, the biblical theologian must elaborate this total message. The modality of affirmation in passages or individual books should be determined in the light of this total context.

B supports the distinction proposed by P. Henry between the content of a given affirmation (e.g. in Mt 16:16) made at one point of time and later repeated in a biblical passage. A homogeneous development of the thought, and so a more perfect understanding of the affirmation, is both possible and desirable.—F. L. M.

175. K. RAHNER, "Über die Schriftinspiration," *ZKT* 78 ('56) 137-168.

Scriptural inspiration is an intrinsic element in the formation of the Church: it is God's authorship of the Church, insofar as this extends to the Scriptures. The argument for this thesis, which applies primarily to the NT, analogously to the OT, is as follows: God willed to found the Church as His definitive instrument of salvation; since the primitive Church was the Church "coming-into-being," and was to be the norm for the Church of all future time, God had a unique relation to it; and since Scripture is a constitutive element of the Church "coming-into-being," God with a unique providence willed and accomplished its writing. This theory provides a plausible concrete explanation of the abstract concept of inspiration. It answers the question of the dual authorship: God's authorship demands, rather than obliterates, that of the hagiographer. It gives a new explanation of how the Church recognizes a writing as inspired: by recognizing it as an expression of the Church's own essential nature and as a part of the self-realization of the primitive Church. The theory also requires a new answer to the question whether the hagiographer was aware of his inspiration: in the sense of our formalized theological notion of inspira-

tion, no; but in the sense that he was consciously writing as part of the living voice of the Church "coming-into-being," yes.—J. M. D.

176. H. CHADWICK, "The Authorship of The Egerton Papyrus No. 3," *HTR** 49 ('56) 145-151.

Examination of style, argumentation, and grouping of biblical references support the position of Grant and Leaney, that this "Gospel Commentary" is the work of Origen, though actual identification of the work is quite impossible. Less support, however, should be given to Leaney's inclination to style the work a homily rather than a commentary because of the occurrence of the phrase "as it is written" and similar formulas. If Origen's authorship is agreed upon, paleographers must reconsider their conclusion that the Fragment is early third century. The evidence does not disprove the possibility or even probability of a date between 225 and 235. Some probability can be attached to Leaney's conjectural restoration in Fragment 1, recto, column 1. Leaney has suggested that the "holy City" of Mt 4:5 means the heavenly city of God, rather than the earthly Jerusalem. In the restoration of Fragment 2, column 1, it seems that the reference is to Zechariah 6:12 and not, as Grant and Leaney have argued, to 14:7.—W. J. B.

177. G. MALDFELD, "Papyrus Bodmer II = Joh. Kap. 1-14 (Plate I)," *NovT* 1 ('56) 153-155.

The *Bibliotheca Bodmeriana*, situated in Cologny, Switzerland, on the shore of Lake Geneva, possesses a papyrus containing the first fourteen chapters of St. John's Gospel. The remarkably well preserved manuscript, written apparently between 150-250 A.D. can be read without difficulty, as the facsimile of Jn 1:1-14 demonstrates. The complete text will be soon published by Professor Dr. Victor Martin of Geneva who meanwhile informs us that the papyrus omits the pericope about the adulterous woman (7:53-8:11) and the verse (5:4) which speaks of an angel coming down and moving the waters of the pool. Until all the chapters are published scholars cannot determine the type of text here represented. Hitherto there were fourteen different fragments on papyrus for the Gospel of St. John. Papyrus Bodmer II is perhaps the oldest and certainly the most complete papyrus manuscript of the Fourth Gospel.—J. J. C.

178. J. W. MARCHAND, "The Gothic Evidence For 'Euthalian Matter,'" *HTR** 49 ('56) 159-167.

Between the fourth and seventh centuries a recension of at least the Pauline and Catholic Epistles into thought lines was made; it is attributed variously to Euthalius, Evagrius, even to Pamphilius, but traditionally it is referred to as the "Euthalian Matter." The date of this work is not yet clear. Competent authorities, such as Von Soden, Robinson, and Conybeare, working from Syrian, Armenian versions, and an edition by Zacagnius (1698), which is neither complete nor accurate, have attempted to establish the date. The second problem

is to separate the genuine text from later accretions. Philological and historical study, based on the Gothic version, offers unimpeachable evidence as to date and genuinity. Examination of the Codices Ambrosiani, the Codex Argenteus, the Giessen Fragment, and the Gothic Bible seems to establish that Gothic evidence antedates any previous evidence, and any inquiry into these questions must respect the witness of Gothic evidence.—W. J. B.

179. R. C. FULLER, "‘I do believe them’—the Canonical Scriptures," *Tablet* 208 ('56) 203-204.

Recent correspondence in *The Times* reveals a variety of answers to the question put to Anglican ordinands concerning belief in the canonical Scriptures. Whence arises the difference between the Catholic and Protestant canon? Art. VI of Queen Elizabeth's thirty-nine articles accepts as canonical those books whose authority was never doubted in the Church. Yet this is not logically applied in AV, which excludes the deuterocanonical books of OT but not those of NT. The real reason for rejecting the OT deuterocanonical books was prejudice against the Latin Bible and the Church. These books were in the LXX, accepted by the first Christians and, probably, by the Jews, though they later rejected them along with the LXX. Origen excluded them from his list, but he was simply giving the Jewish canon. Art. VI appeals to Jerome's authority; but he held the opposite view both in his earlier and later years. His omission of the books from his Vulgate did not secure their rejection—they were simply added from the Old Latin. Jewish and Anglican attempts to return to the pure Word of God by excluding all but Hebrew Scriptures rested on a false criterion of inspiration, and the Reformers have been proved wrong in imagining that any sixteenth-century Hebrew or Greek text was necessarily more exact than the ancient versions.—G. G.

GOSPELS (GENERAL)

180. A. W. ARGYLE, "Did Jesus Speak Greek?" *ExpT** 67 ('56) 383.

Draper (*ExpT*, 67 ['56] 317) does not refute the evidence proposed by the author (*ExpT*, 67 ['56] 92). Draper claims that Christ probably did not use the LXX of Is 50:6 in Mt 5:39-40. However, the Hebrew is very different from the LXX; if Jesus used the Hebrew version of Isaiah, He hardly said what is recorded in Matthew. Draper claims that the Greek sayings of Jesus are Semitic. The frequent use of "kingdom" without qualification, however, to mean "kingdom of heaven" and the frequent usage of the genitive absolute in Matthew is Hellenistic, not Semitic. Draper further claims that Aramaic was widespread even among the Greek speaking gentiles. In this he disagrees with Schürer and forgets that Aramaic was unpopular even with the Jews of Dispersion. Jesus did speak Aramaic, but He also knew and spoke Greek.—R. E. V.

181. T. A. BURKILL,* "The Competence of the Sanhedrin," *ViCh* 10 ('56) 80-96.

Arguments advanced to support the hypothesis that the Sanhedrin had no power to inflict capital punishment for crimes against the Law of Moses during the procuratorial period are unconvincing. The account of the trial of Jesus in Mk 14:55-65 is full of internal and external incongruities which are not fully resolved by the explanations of G. D. Kilpatrick (*The Trial of Jesus*. Oxford, 1953). The real meaning seems to be that Jesus could not be convicted of an obvious capital crime against the Mosaic Law and so was accused of political crime before Pilate. Jn 18:32, stating that the Jews reminded Pilate of the legal incapacity of their tribunal, is an improbable passage, seemingly apologetic in intent. Arguments advanced to support the hypothesis from the Jerusalem Talmud (San. 1; 7, 2) are vitiated by the Babylonian Talmud (San. 41a; Ab. Zar. 8b); they are seen to be references to a legal tradition subsequent to the trial of Jesus. J. Jeremias uses the *Pericope Adulterae* in Jn 7:53-8:12 to support the hypothesis ("Zur Geschichtlichkeit des Verhörs Jesu vor dem hohen Rat," *ZNTW* 43 ['50-'51] 147 ff.). If that story is historically trustworthy at all, however, it may indicate merely that the enemies of Jesus sought to force Him to restrict His doctrines of mercy and forgiveness, and not that they recommended resort to the Roman procurator. Jeremias' interpretation of *Megillat Ta'anit* 6 in favor of the hypothesis is also inconclusive.

The contrary view, that the Sanhedrin could inflict the death penalty, is supported by texts from Josephus, despite Kilpatrick's doubts about the meaning of *Bell.* 2, 8, 9, and Juster's questioning of the authenticity of *Ant.* 20, 9, 1. Acts 6:8-7:60, detailing the execution of Stephen after condemnation by the Sanhedrin, strengthens this view. Additional evidence is furnished by the account of the burning of an adulteress in San. 7, 2 of Mishnah, although the date of that event is disputed, as well as by Agrippa's letter to Caligula cited by Philo (*Legatio ad Gaium*, 39) and by the inscription discovered by Clermont-Ganneau in 1871 which threatens with death Roman citizens who violate the Temple.—J. F. Br.

182. J. DUPONT, "Le nom d'apôtres a-t-il été donné aux douze par Jésus?" (2^e partie), *L'Orient Syrien* 1 ('56) 425-444.

St. Luke uses the word *apostolos* in the two contexts which Mark and Matthew have already presented to us: that of the institution of the college of the Twelve and that of the Galilean mission, (cf. 1st part). Before examining these two accounts in the third Gospel D considers the word *apostolos* as employed in other passages: Lk 22:14; 17:5-6; 9:37-43; 24:10; 11:49; 6:10; 9:10; 6:13. Here D brings out the precise use of it made by Luke as well as expounding the parallel passages in Mark and Matthew.

D reaches his central point in his last commentary on Lk 6:13. It reads: ". . . and he chose twelve of them (whom also he named apostles)." It seems

that by breaking down the terms in verse 13, we would have them say more than Luke intended. Luke's intention doesn't seem to be to instruct his readers as to the origin of the term *apostolos*, but rather to indicate that the disciples now in question are the apostles: a Christian did not have to learn whom this term designated. Therefore, the name apostle simply serves to determine the identity of the twelve elect. The text does not say that Jesus gave the name of apostles to the twelve at the moment of their election; the construction rather suggests the opposite view.

The entire essay is summed up with these conclusions: (1) Jesus constituted the college of the Twelve. (2) From the first phase of His ministry in Galilee, Jesus *sent* the Twelve on a preaching tour. (3) It is possible and even probable that on this occasion the Twelve were considered as the *chelihin*, those *sent* by Jesus. Jesus Himself could have designated them by this name but nothing in the Gospel permits affirming that He did. (4) Even admitting that the title of *chelihin* belonged to the Twelve at the time of the Galilean mission, the expression would not have been known in the precise sense in which the title apostles was used in Christian language. (5) Without forcing their true meaning the Gospel texts do not permit affirming, nor even supposing that Jesus during His earthly life gave this title of apostles to the Twelve as a designation proper to them alone. (6) The usage of the primitive Church, where the title of apostles is not exclusively reserved to the Twelve, and where it allows an essential relation with the Resurrection of Jesus, dissuades searching for the immediate origin of this title in the evangelical period.—J. G. C.

183. W. NEIL, "The Nature Miracles," *ExpT** 67 ('56) 369-372.

The acceptance of the great miracle of the Incarnation overshadows and entails acceptance of the lesser miracles. The early Christian community saw in the miracles not the mere unusual event but the clear manifestation of the presence and purposes of God. Questions on the nature of the actual event or on the possible interruption of any fixed physical laws should be replaced by an inquiry into the meaning of each miracle as a sign of God's purposes. The message of each miracle will be revealed by the context, but especially by the relation to OT prophecy and the Messianic kingdom. In general the purpose of the nature miracles was not to win a following or to give spectacular proof of the Messiahship but to reveal God's dominion over physical and moral evil. The draught of fishes points to the conversion of men. In the category of prophetic symbols or acted parables, the barren fig tree refers to Israel the fruitless vineyard. The better wine of Cana shows the richness of the new wine of Christian truth. The stilling of the tempest represents God's power over Satan and hints at the real identity of Jesus; the idea of the assistance of Christ in the storm of life is also present. The multiplication of the loaves and fishes is filled with Old and New Testament concepts: the manna, water from the rock, Christ as superseding Moses, the Bread of Life, the Messianic banquet, and the mercy of God.—T. A. J.

184. E. VOGT, "Une lumière nouvelle sur la semaine de la passion," *Christus* No. 11 ('56) 413-421.

This is a commentary on Mlle. A. Jaubert's recent observation that the Last Supper took place Tuesday evening. (A. Jaubert, "La date de la dernière Cène," *RHR* 146 ['54] 140-173).

The high priests and the people ate the paschal lamb on the day of Christ's death, a Friday; Jesus and His disciples had *already* eaten it, the day "when they sacrificed the Pasch" (Mk 14:12), that is, the day "on which it was necessary that the Pasch should be killed" (Lk 22:7), in each case the 14th of the month (Lv 23:5; Ex 12:9). The Qumran finds confirm the hypothesis of a double calendar. Jesus *could have* used the unofficial calendar which was used at Qumran and probably in many books of the OT. His reason for using it was that He wanted to observe the ancient ritual of the Pasch on a legal day before accomplishing it by His death on the day of the official Pasch. In the ancient calendar, the 14th always fell on a Tuesday. Despite current prejudice, nothing in the Gospel texts forces the belief that the Last Supper occurred on Thursday. The Tuesday date resolves all difficulties by providing a place for each event in a crowded history. It solves the puzzle of the deliberations of the Sanhedrin by confirming the prescriptions of the Jewish penal law of the second century A.D., transmitted by the Mishnah, which prohibited death sentences on the eve of a Sabbath or feast, but allowed them on the day following deliberations. An intervening day explains the different circumstances of Pilate's interrogations, and his wife's dream is easier to understand since she knew the story of Jesus before her dream.

This attractive hypothesis is confirmed by a second-century tradition, by St. Paul (1 Cor 11:24), by the Canon of the Mass (which place the institution of the Eucharist on the eve of the Passion and not of the death of Christ) and by Wednesday's Tenebrae in the Holy Week liturgy.—A. F.

SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

185. F. J. MCCOOL, "Revival of Synoptic Source-Criticism," *TS* 17 ('56) 459-493.

At the outset M gives a brief exposition of Vaganay's solution to the Synoptic problem together with the reasons which have led him to form his hypothesis. He then discusses the reactions of other scholars to these reasons as well as to the nature of the sources which Vaganay has postulated. Cerfaux and Léon-Dufour agree with Vaganay's assertion that Mg (the Greek translation of the first Aramaic gospel), and not Mk, is the source of the triple tradition in the Synoptics. For them, however, Mg is closer to the flux of oral tradition than the rather literary document which Vaganay has reconstructed. Defenders of a modified Two-Source theory, chiefly Levie and Schmid, would consider a general acceptance of Vaganay's position as regress rather than progress in Synoptic study. Before assessing these different approaches to a Synoptic solution, M

presents aspects of the problem which have been stressed recently by scholars such as V. Taylor, C. H. Dodd, W. L. Knox, N. A. Dahl, who have been completely uninfluenced by the preoccupations of the present discussion. In his conclusion M examines the three reasons proposed by Vaganay to justify his hypothesis. The Vaganay hypothesis comes closer than even the modified form of the Two-Source theory to the goal of satisfying the traditional data of external tradition, but the probative power of this superiority should not be overrated. The argument of the fivefold structure in Mt does not seem to carry the significance Vaganay wishes it to have; still we must look beyond Mk in order to find another text which will explain the positive and negative agreements of Mt-Lk against Mk. The psychological considerations offered by Levie and Schmid seem to preclude a satisfactory solution in terms of Vaganay's conception of Mg. The answer may come from written documentation, or possibly from oral tradition.—H. R. P.

186. D. M. STANLEY, "The Conception of Salvation in the Synoptic Gospels," *CBQ* 18 ('56) 345-363.

Our written Gospels differ from the oral kerygma in that (1) they are intended for readers already Christian, and consequently (2) attempt to interpret theologically the words and deeds of Christ. Thus they represent a fourfold advance over the soteriology of the apostolic preaching: (1) as regards the salvific nature of Christ's death; (2) theology of Jesus' miracles; (3) Incarnation-doctrine in infancy Gospels; (4) trend towards the Johannine "realized eschatology."

In Mk, as in the primitive preaching, soteriology is treated as an aspect of Christology: Mk's salvation-doctrine is presented as an answer in the existential order to his main question, "Who is Jesus?" Mk shows the connection between Jesus' mission and sin (2:17), and depicts it as a struggle against Satan (1:12-13, 23-26, 39; 3:14-15; 6:7,13). Moreover, Jesus' passion, death, resurrection, prophesied by Him, are part of the divine plan of salvation (2:20; 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34; 9:12; 10:39,45; 12:10; 14:24).

Matthean soteriology stems from one fundamental insight: the kingdom of Heaven is established upon earth as a result of Jesus' death and resurrection through the institution and growth of the Church, whose character is determined by the collective rejection of Israel and the admission of the gentiles. Mt's theology of salvation may be resumed under four points: (1) Like Mk, Mt relates Jesus' earthly career to sin's destruction (1:21; 4:14-16; 15:24), especially by portraying His miracles as the initial assault upon Satan's kingdom (8:29; 10:1; cf. 8:16-17). (2) In addition to texts paralleled in Mk, Mt underscores the redemptive nature of Jesus' passion and death in 12:39-40. (3) Characteristic of Mt is the use of certain parables to show how Israel's rejection of Jesus is part of God's salvific plan: cf. 20:1-16; 20:28-31; 21:33-43; 22:11-14; cf. 23:1-36. (4) Mt gives a special eschatological orientation to his soteriology (10:23; 16:27-28; 19:28; 23:37-39).

Peculiar to Lk is the introduction of a Christian vocabulary of salvation: *soteria* (1:69,71,77; 19:9), *soter* (1:47; 2:11), *to soterion* (2:30; 3:6), as also his insistence upon the universalist nature of the redemption. He approaches Johannine soteriology by regarding Jesus' death and resurrection as an "assumption" (9:51) and as an "exodos" (9:31) (cf. Jn 13:1). Like the other Synoptics, Lk relates Jesus' public ministry to salvation (4:13; 12:49-50; 19:11).—D. M. S. (Author)

187. G. W. BUCHANAN, "Mark xiv. 54," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 27.

Phos has been commonly translated "fire" although the word means "light." The hypothesis that the passage is a translation of a Semitic original suggests a solution. The vocalic pointing of the middle radical of *'wr* can vary the Greek translation of the Semitic to mean "light" or "fire"; a translator working from an unpointed text might have rendered *phos* erroneously. Translators and commentators today are justified in rendering it "fire."—R. E. V.

188. J. A. T. ROBINSON, "The Second Coming—Mark xiv. 62," *ExpT** 67 ('56) 336-340.

The only saying in which Jesus states unequivocally that He is the Messiah is found in Mk 14:62. This verse may also be the only authentic saying in which He predicts His coming in glory as the Son of Man. For the two main sayings besides Mk 14:62 are Mk 8:38 and Mk 13:26 which upon examination do not prove to be conclusively authentic utterances of Jesus. Studying therefore Mk 13:26 by itself one finds in it the echo of two OT passages. One (Ps 110) with its reference to being seated at the right hand of God clearly indicates a vindication of the Messiah. The other text is Dn 7:13 in which the Son of Man, representing the saints of the Most High, comes to the throne of God for judgment. No doubt Jesus understood the text in its original sense, that the Son of Man comes to God in ascent and vindication. Very fittingly then Jesus addressing the Sanhedrin alludes to this text, for He too out of suffering and death is about to be brought before the throne of God in a crowning act of vindication that the judges themselves will witness. And this act would be the resurrection, as is clear from Matthew and Luke who say "from now on" you shall see the Son of Man etc. Furthermore the enthronement language suits the resurrection alone, because there is never a suggestion that Jesus enters into His triumph only at the second coming.—J. J. C.

189. W. J. P. BOYD, "Peter's Denials—Mark xiv. 68, Luke xxii. 57," *ExpT** 67 ('56) 341.

Black's theory (*An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, p. 61) that Lk 22:57 is a correct translation and Mk 14:68 an incorrect translation of an identical Aramaic original should be rejected. Mk 14:68 and Lk 22:60 and Mk 14:71-Lk 22:57 are the correct parallels. Lk's inversion of the first two denials probably is an editorial change. Mk's account reveals the progress of

Peter's defection in the three denials and seems more correct psychologically.—R. E. V.

190. R. G. BRATCHER, "A Note on *huios theou* (Mark xv. 39)," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 27-28.

The centurion's confession of Jesus as *huios theou* has been rendered (1) by the indefinite "a son of God" meaning that Jesus was an outstanding man or (2) by the definite "the Son of God" indicating a Christian confession of faith in Jesus. Grammatically the indefinite sense is not necessary. Matthew preserves and strengthens the definite interpretation while Luke changes the meaning radically and understands it in the indefinite sense. Luke in this case apparently misinterpreted his source sc. Mark, whose Gospel climaxes the Passion story with a gentile's confession of Jesus as the Son of God.—R. E. V.

191. R. LAURENTIN, "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2 (I)," *Biblica* 37 ('56) 435-456.

Of four theories advanced to explain the highly Semitic style of St. Luke's Gospel of the Infancy (chapters 1 and 2, except for 1:1-4, written in elegant Greek), that of a Hebrew source is most convincing. This study, more of which will follow, develops the argument from etymological allusions. The Greek has forfeited much of the sense which a proposed Hebrew version would show in the use of the names John, Jesus, and Gabriel. The significance of the names sheds light on the entire context of the chapters. The four hypotheses can be summarized: (1) an original composition that imitates the style of the LXX, (2) the use of a Greek source, (3) an Aramaic source, (4) a Hebrew source. In support of the argument in favor of a Hebrew source, a dozen examples of words or phrases can be listed, whose meaning is greatly clarified by recourse to a Hebrew original.—R. L. T.

192. P. WINTER AND V. TAYLOR, "Sources of the Lucan Passion Narrative," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 95.

W considers that Luke placed chapters 1-2 before a composite account for which he had several sources. Lk 1-2 came from a source distinct from any other. Luke used for his Passion narrative not only Mark but also a non-Markan record which formed a coherent consecutive narrative.

T appraises W on Lk 21-24. W sees Luke's sources to be L (a fusion of a special source S and of Q), Mk, and Sx (non-editorial passages later than Mk). Lk 21:20-36 is not a free rendering of Mk 13, but in Lk 21:21a,23a,26b-27, and 29-33 the editor has made Marcan insertions into a coherent and independent non-Markan source. A non-Markan undercurrent appears in Lk 22:14-46,63-65, in many parts of Lk 23, and in Lk 24:13-53 except for an editorial supplement in 21b-24. Lk 22:54b-62 (with a residue of non-Markan matter) and Lk 24:1-11 are based on Mk. Lk 22:66b-71, Lk 23:27-31 (Sx), 39-43 (Sx), and Lk 24:36-43 contain either post-editorial insertions or hag-

gadic material. L appears to have contained an account of the Passion and Resurrection that differs from the ending of Mk, in that it lacks any account of the empty tomb. If Lk 24:13-35 is based on L, there may have been an early account of an appearance of the Risen Christ to Peter. W concludes that Luke (1) used as a source for Lk 21-24 a literary record with characteristics of its own, (2) was painstakingly accurate in its use, (3) was not the author of the source.

T concludes that W has made obsolete the idea that the Lucan Passion Narrative is merely a re-editing of Mk and has reopened the question of its sources to scholarly examination.—J. O'N.

GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

193. D. M. STANLEY, "Bulletin of the New Testament: The Johannine Literature," *TS* 17 ('56) 516-531.

Several important comparative studies have been published recently on the relations between the Qumran doctrine and Jn. Lucetta Mowry uses the Essene literature to understand the background of the Fourth Gospel. Geoffrey Graystone's study is serious and original, although his laudable reserve is occasionally marred by overanxiety to protect the Christian revelation. F. M. Braun approaches the problem more positively. He links Jn and the Qumran writings in certain verbal analogies and thought-patterns. Independently, Raymond E. Brown made a similar study to "establish relationships on the basis of terminology and ideology." A different approach to the question has been taken by Joseph Schmitt in a series of articles remarkable for their insights and profundity.

There are two studies of the Fourth Gospel. C. K. Barrett published a full-dress commentary in the English tradition, and Louis Bouyer has written a brilliant example of the French *haute vulgarisation* to replace the commentary composed before his entrance into the Church. It is dedicated to Oscar Cullmann, Bouyer's master, and shows Cullmann's influence in its accentuation of the sacramental character of the Gospel. Bouyer is also indebted to C. H. Dodd, whose interpretation, he thinks, presents the authentic character of Jn. The introductory essay on the Johannine concept of history is the more welcome, as it is so badly needed today. (Barrett suffers from the lack of such insight.)

Humphrey Green has made a new attempt to analyze the structure of the prologue to the Fourth Gospel. Donatien Mollat's study of the incident at Jacob's well (Jn 4:1-42) is thoughtful. David R. Griffiths has made a very important comparison between the Fourth Gospel and the Second Isaiah. Also noteworthy are two recent studies of sections of the first Johannine epistle by G. B. Bauer and Celestin Charlier.

The new popular study on the Apocalypse by L. Cerfaux and J. Cambier will be welcomed. They cite at length and explain pertinent OT texts at the beginning of each section of the commentary. They should be praised for their

detached sacrifice of anything which did not contribute to the aim: the reading of the inspired text by the Christian reader. The authors have contributed much to the understanding of this baffling book.—J. A. D.

194. F. W. YOUNG, "A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," *ZNW** 64 ('55) 215-232.

Before the Christian era, the book of Isaiah and the prophet himself had become the subject of considerable speculation, as some hitherto neglected non-canonical literature proves. By a comparison of Isaiah and John one finds that the prophet is quoted frequently in the Gospel, and that there is a similarity of phraseology and ideology which is hardly accidental. Particularly interesting is the study of Jn 6 (the promise of the Eucharist), with the reference to the word coming down from heaven, and to grass, which seems to allude to Isaiah's illustration of the transitoriness of man. A direct influence does not appear evident but an indirect one seems established, the influence of the symbolical and spiritual interpretation of Isaiah apparently prevalent at the time. In "the development of this mystical strand of theology in Judaism the book of Isaiah played a unique role. Furthermore, it is suggested that the Fourth Gospel itself was under the influence of such a tendency and also reflects the importance of the book of Isaiah for the movement."—J. J. C.

195. J. N. SANDERS, "The Gospel and the Historian," *Listener** 56 ('56) 753-757.

Till the last century John's Gospel stood supreme in Christian estimation. Why is its historicity now so widely questioned? First Hegel's disciples claiming the Fourth Gospel as the "synthesis" in the development of early Christianity, relegated it to the mid-second century. There followed the liberal school under Harnack, which, though imbued with a more scientific spirit, was so influenced by natural positivism as to reject *a priori* the possibility of divine influence in human affairs. Hence the antithesis, Jesus of history—Christ of faith. Effective challenge came from Schweitzer, but he in turn was influenced by pantheism to the extent of denying the Incarnation and holding that Jesus was mistaken in His belief about Himself.

John's Gospel claims to be the work of an eyewitness who collects and presents evidence to show that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (20:30). It is vital to his theology that the events he relates really happened. Now history is not simply a narration, but a selection of events, based on the historian's "criteria of significance." John's criterion is that the events he relates offer the evidence for his belief. To accept this criterion and its underlying presuppositions is to accept the historicity of the Fourth Gospel. Our acceptance rests ultimately not on historical but on philosophical grounds; in fact to accept the historicity of the Gospel is itself an "act of faith." Rejection of the Gospel's historicity raises a host of insoluble problems, chief of which is the origin and survival of the Christian faith.—G. G.

196. H. VAN DEN BUSSCHE, "De Structuur van het vierde Evangelie," (II) *ColBG* 2 ('56) 182-199.

The structure of the Fourth Gospel shows that John intended not a biography of Christ, but rather an exposition of the dialectic of His revelation to the Jews and their rejection of this revelation. Christ's public life is set down in two phases: Jesus' own revelation of His Messiahship, and the revelation of the Father working in Jesus. The unity of action between Father and Son is proof of the unity of essence in Them. The reaction of the Jews is throughout one of disbelief which leads them to incurable blindness and to the loss of the kingdom of heaven, now given over to the gentiles. Contrary to a popular theory, Cana must be considered the beginning of the first phase of the public life. In this, we find three typical reactions to Jesus' self-revelation: (1) Nicodemus, the typical Pharisee, seeks a *critical* sign of Jesus' claim to Messiahship, and precisely therefore is blinded; (2) the Samaritan woman, whose providential conversation with Christ has only one end: to answer by her own faith the question posed and already answered by Jesus, "Who is this who speaks with me?"; (3) the official of Capharnaum, who, with little time to waste seeking criteria of Jesus' claim, asks only the exercise of His power in his son's cure. The second phase of the public life begins with the multiplication of the loaves (ch. 6). This miracle, meant as a foretaste of the Father through Christ's Body and Blood, separates true believers from those who are struck only by Christ's sensational power, but do not believe in His Sonship. The reaction of disbelief further blinds the Jews until the cure of the man born blind, where, in excommunicating the cured man, they have definitively rejected Jesus. After the Good Shepherd, the kingdom of God is transferred from the self-blinded Jews to the receptive gentiles. The Jewish fate, however, was sealed even before chapter 7. From then on we have only a climactic description of the tense struggle (*worstelen*) between revelation and disbelief. Chapter 12, the final journey to Jerusalem and inevitable death, is only the logical, but divinely willed, consequence of this struggle. It is Jesus' journey to the *finis* of His earthly life: redemption of the whole world.—D. J. F.

197. J. MEHLMAN, "A Note on John i. 3," *ExpT** 67 ('56) 340-341.

Historical witnesses that *quod factum est* should conclude Jn 1:3 rather than begin 1:4 are presented and evaluated. Adamantius has been overlooked by commentators and might be the oldest witness to the present partition of verses. If Adamantius' dialogue originates from Syria and is prior to 311 A.D., there is no question that the reading was adopted in Alexandria to support the Arian doctrine on Christ. According to St. Ambrose, the Arians, Gnostics, and Manichaeans held the reading *quod factum est in ipso, vita erat*. Other sources support the opinion that the reading of Adamantius was adopted in Alexandria.—R. E. V.

198. J. J. TWOMEY, "Barabbas was a Robber," *Scripture* 8 ('56) 115-119.

What did St. John mean by calling Barabbas a *lestes*? pirate? brigand? irregular soldier? robber? Our best clue to the real meaning is to be found in the Passion accounts. The mob comes *hos epi lesten* against Jesus in the Garden. Would such a force be needed for a mere robber? Matthew calls Barabbas a *desmion episemon*, wrongly translated by Douay "a notorious prisoner." It should perhaps be "a captive leader." Mark says that Barabbas was in prison in connection with "the sedition" but the word may well indicate a national rising. Moreover, the priests and Pharisees disliked these "rebels"—hence Pilate's idea that they would choose Jesus instead of Barabbas. By calling Barabbas the equivalent of "one of the *maquis*" (and Josephus' use of the word supports this explanation) the Evangelists showed excellently how the true Messiah had been rejected and replaced by the Jews' false idea of a political Messiah.—P. D.

CHARACTERS OF THE GOSPELS

199. J. PLAGNIEUX, "Chronique de Théologie Mariale," *RScRel* 30 ('56) 372-389.

A number of recent contributions have been published within the last four years. The matter is divided into four main subjects: general works, Marian dogmas, Marian co-redemption and pious literature.

Among the general works should be mentioned the third volume of Father Du Manoir's series, entitled *Maria*, on the history of the Marian cult and spirituality. Fr. Laurentin has written a valuable introduction and a conclusion. The same Father has also published a very informative *Court Traité de théologie mariale* (Paris, 1954), which the Dominicans consider as basic.

In a more specialized field, a relevant study, Fr. Gallus' *Interpretatio mariologica protoevangelii posttridentina* (Rome, 1953), is erudite and exegetically sound. This work, which is the first part of an intended study, embodies the Catholic exegesis covering the years from 1545 to 1660. Another biblical enquiry is *La Mère des fidèles, Essai de théologie johannique* (Paris, Casterman, 1953), by Fr. F. M. Braun, O.P. The central theme of this book is concerned with the question of Mary's mediation.

Among the other more important works mentioned are: M. Jugie, *L'Immaculée-Conception dans l'Ecriture sainte et dans la Tradition orientale* (Rome, 1952). (The stress is on the question of Oriental theology); R. Guardini, *Die Mutter des Herrn*, (Wurzburg, 1955). (P sharply criticizes Guardini's interpretation of Mary's answer to the angel: "since I do not know man"). To these books can be added C. de Koninck's *La piété du Fils* (Univ. Laval, 1954), which is a scientific treatise on the Assumption.—J. H.

200. F. SPADAFORA, "Opinioni esegetiche e biografia mariana," *Marianum* 57 ('56) 212-227.

To counteract the tendency of minimizing the value of texts which refer to the Blessed Virgin, S treats some articles that appeared in *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* ('54) and some books about our Lady. S shows, with several examples, that the proper interpretation of Scripture will explain the reason for its silence about our Lady, develop the few references to her, and bring to light references to her that are hidden in many texts. S, giving examples, classifies Marian biography as (1) scientific, (2) historical, (3) literary. S concludes that though few passages of the Gospels refer to our Lady, the problems of interpretation are many and difficult.—G. Gm.

201. "Marie et les écrits johanniques," *AmiCl* 66 ('56) 687-689.

Two studies are reviewed; The first concerns "Jn 19:25-27 et la maternité spirituelle de Marie" (A. Thyès, *Marianum* 1 ['56] 80-117). It is commonly admitted today that St. John found himself given the care of Mary, and that by this act Mary was constituted mother of all the redeemed. In what scriptural sense is this universal spiritual maternity revealed? The literal sense is two-fold: we must distinguish between the *sensus dictionis*, i.e. the sense which the words had when they were spoken, and the *sensus scriptiois*, i.e. that which St. John saw when he wrote them, after years of reflection and theological maturity. It cannot be admitted, however, that St. John intended to affirm a spiritual maternity of all the Christians in Mary in the literal sense; it is rather a fuller sense. The study of tradition confirms this: the affirmation of her universal maternity and of her causality in relation to the grace of the whole Church is of a later date.

The other study reviewed is that of F. M. Braun, "La Femme vêtue de soleil (Apoc XII)," *RTh* 55 ('55) 639-669. First he refers to Le Frois' book: the Woman is the Church, but the Church personified in the very mother of Jesus. It is certain, however, that the sacred author applies to the Virgin Mary the biblical image of the woman giving birth to the Messiah. It would, therefore, be vain to oppose the defenders of the individual Marian sense to the defenders of the collective ecclesiastical sense. B then brings up the objection of the "woman in the wilderness" (Ap 12:6 & 14). A study of the texts of Ex brings him to conclude that here again all applies analogically to Mary and to the Church. Therefore, "the woman clothed with the sun," as well as "the woman in the wilderness," is the Church contemplated in Mary by St. John.—J. H.

202. N. M. FLANAGAN, "Our Lady's Vow of Virginity," *MarSt* 7 ('56) 103-121.

Persistent efforts to avoid the idea of a virginal birth and of a vow of virginity, by attacking the authenticity of Lk 1:34-35, have produced the opposite effect: they have brought to light overwhelming proofs of the verses' authenticity. The exegesis of the text, however, remains disputable. The com-

mon teaching of exegetes regards Lk 1:34 as an indication of a proposal or vow of virginity on the part of Mary. Despite this almost universal opinion of the Scholastics, of later theologians, and of exegetes, opposition to the use of the Lucan text as a proof of Mary's vow of virginity has been present in Catholic thinking since the time of Cajetan. In modern times, Landersdorfer, like Cajetan, considers that Mary simply was puzzled: "How can this be, for I do not know man, i.e., for I am still a virgin." In view of Jewish customs concerning betrothal and marriage Haugg and Gächter would insist upon a purely natural interpretation, and thus rule out any vow of virginity. A third possibility could be investigated. Were these words spoken by Mary simply a literary device employed by Luke? What might have Luke intended by them? —R. C.

203. J.-P. AUDET, "L'annonce à Marie," *RB* 63 ('56) 346-374.

God often revealed His will to man in definite forms and patterns: dreams, prophetic teachings, angelic messages. Each genre has characteristic marks constant all through SS. Exegetes can compare the constants of messages, special greeting, new name and function, prediction, sign, etc., to interpret accurately the substance of any one of them. Guided by these, especially the message to Gideon, we can cut through the traditional difficulties of Mary's Annunciation. The literary genre of messages demands a stronger translation. "Rejoice, Privileged One, the Lord is with thee. You will conceive. . . ." Gabriel's words are clear. His Messianic greeting, the prophetic name and function, the child to be born of a maiden, His regal glory, strike responsive chords in her pious mind. She understands immediately. She is the privileged maiden. She will conceive the Messiah as Isaiah foretold, but how? She is espoused to Joseph but not yet taken into his house. Relations before this time were legally frowned upon. Thus Mary's anxious reaction to the message is not from a prior bond of vow or promise of virginity but from her devotion to the laws and customs in force at that time. The angel's reply to her anxiety supposes this understanding. She will not conceive of Joseph, but of the Holy Spirit. A vow upsets the balance, pattern, and unity of a message. It distorts Luke's Messianic, Incarnation-centered purpose in narrating the Annunciation. To Luke Mary's virginity is a matter of fact, but he is not treating of her personal honors. The Incarnation absorbs his mind. Mary the virgin figures largely in this event, not as consecrated to chastity or virginity but as the promised sign of Isaiah. She fulfills this sign as a virgin in the sense of ancient times, a young maiden, a girl of marriageable age. The privilege of divine maternity motivated her virginity for the rest of her days.—J. R. L.

204. P. J. DONNELLY, "Our Lady's Virginity *ante partum*," *MarSt* 7 ('56) 13-42.

Both the fact and the precise meaning of Mary's virginity *ante partum* have been expressed dogmatically by the Lateran Council of 649. This dogma is so

clearly revealed in Lk 1:26-38 and in Mt 1:18-25, that it is *de fide, ex clara scriptura*. The genuinity and authenticity of these solidly established texts have been ably defended by outstanding scholars against the attacks of rationalistic critics. Silence on the part of Paul and Mark by no means proves either that they were unaware of or that they denied Mary's virginity *ante partum*. On the contrary, Christ's supernatural origin is a tacit postulate of Paul's entire Christology, just as it is clearly implicit throughout the Gospel of Mark. Persistent attempts to describe the evolution of the "legend" of the virginal conception have always remained nebulous, indeterminate, intangible, and completely without foundation. In the last analysis, the only explanation for the preaching of such an astounding doctrine by the early Church was its truth.—R. C.

205. G. OWENS, "Our Lady's Virginity in the Birth of Jesus," *MarSt* 7 ('56) 43-68.

Seldom does the dogma of Mary's virginity in and during the birth of Christ receive as much attention as her virginity before and after the Nativity. The usual meaning of the dogma is that the Child was born from the womb of His mother without the womb's being opened, and consequently without the destruction of the physical signs of virginity possessed by one who is virgin in conception. The official utterances of the Church on the question are few. The first explicit formulation appeared in a letter of the Synod of Milan to Pope Siricius in the year 390, while the dogmatic definition was given by the Lateran Council in 649. It is very difficult to discover texts in Scripture that explicitly make distinct reference to the virginity *in partu*; the point of view is generally one of conception. The patristic witnesses of the first few centuries offer little clarification. Apart from the fear of Docetism, their awareness of Mary's dignity as Mother of God, recipient of His most singular gifts, developed only gradually.—R. C.

206. H. E. W. TURNER, "The Virgin Birth," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 12-17.

Though the primitive kerygma is silent, veiled references to the virginal conception may be present in Gal 4:4; Mk 6:3; Jn 1:12-13; 7:41-42; 9:29 and 8:41. In Luke's infancy narrative, the unusual presence of a Jewish and Messianic background refutes any theory of a pagan origin of the tradition. While Luke may have prefixed chapters 1 and 2 to an original gospel beginning in chapter 3, the verses 1:34-35 are not, as Vincent Taylor maintains, interpolated. That the verses are genuine is shown by the use of virgin in verse 27, by the announcement of Elizabeth's conception, and by Mary's subsequent actions. "Their purification," as found in some texts, might refer to a family act rather than to the purification of the mother and the redemption of the son. The surprise of Joseph and Mary at the words of Simeon may refer to the fact that a stranger spoke to them and not to the prophecy itself. Legal custom of the Jews can explain references to Joseph as a parent. Of doubtful value is Taylor's renewal of the hypothesis that Luke combined an earlier John the Baptist cycle

with parallel traditions in honor of Christ. The attempts to put Quirinius as governor of Syria at the time of the census should yield to historical evidence and to Tertullian's affirmation that Saturninus was governor at the time. That a census was imposed on a client state might be explained as a sanction against Herod. The requirement for the Journey to Bethlehem has not yet been historically elucidated. The source of Luke's infancy narrative may have been Mary or the women mentioned in Lk 8:2 and Acts 21:8-9.

Matthew's birth narrative as a whole has not been seriously challenged and the individual details can be explained. Though his proof-texts, e.g. 1:23, lack a Hebrew tradition for his interpretations, their casual addition confirms the view that they did not give rise to the narratives they support. The substantial independence of the infancy narratives in the first and third Gospels supports their historical value.

Rejection of the virgin birth as inconsistent with divine condescension usually rises from doubts on the historicity of the Incarnation. Brunner's treatment of the virgin birth as an added explanation ignores the fact that uniqueness is not essential to the importance of the virgin birth. A priori explanations, such as that of the older Reformed dogmatic theologians who require the virgin birth for Heb 7:3, and that of Barth who requires it to prevent the transmission of original sin—such explanations show congruity rather than necessity. Barth's a posteriori claim, that the virgin birth is necessary as a confirmatory sign, certainly refutes synergism and Docetism but, like any other arguments we can offer, establishes only the congruity of it.—T. A. J.

207. T. FAHY, "St. John and Elias," *IrTQ* 23 ('56) 285-286.

Did Christ mean literally that John the Baptist was Elias? His prefatory words, "if you wish to take it in," and his subsequent "let him hear that hath ears to hear"—an appeal to the well-disposed among His audience—show that He did not. Yet He purposely permitted a certain ambiguity, to which the absence of the indefinite article in Aramaic contributed: "if you wish to take it in, he, in fact, is (an) Elias—the one destined to come" (Mt 11:14). Later He made His meaning clear to His apostles: "Elias will come and he will restore all things—I tell you that (an) Elias has already come, and they knew him not . . . then the disciples understood that it was about John the Baptist he had spoken to them" (Mt 17:11-13).—G. G.

208. B. HENSON, "St. Peter's Denials of Christ," *Listener** 56 ('56) 267-268.

Peter did not deny Jesus out of disloyalty, whether from cowardice or wavering in faith. At Caesarea Philippi Jesus had disassociated Himself from current Messianic expectations, rebuked Peter for his protest, and told His disciples, "tell no man that I am the Christ." It was loyalty to this injunction that motivated Peter's "I know not the man!" Peter, no doubt, was at fault, but his fault lay in ever going near the high priest's courtyard. By doing this he en-

dangered the whole divine plan, viz. that Christ must go alone to the cross, abandoned by all, as He had foretold at the Last Supper.—G. G.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

209. J. HACKETT, "Echoes of Euripides in Acts of the Apostles?" *IrTQ* 23 ('56) 218-227.

E. R. Dodds, in his commentary on Euripides' *Bacchae* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944) suggests borrowings from Euripides in Acts, indicating parallel expressions, e.g. *theomachoi* and "kick against the goad," and parallel ideas, e.g. miraculous prison escapes. Preliminary review of Luke's style and diction helps to set the matter in true perspective. Much has been made of Luke's relatively pure Greek style. Yet classical scholars like Norden, and Koine experts like De Zwaan and Cadbury, agree this is only a comparative judgment. Luke borrows a few obvious literary conventions, e.g. his prefaces, without maintaining the general standards of Attic composition. At best his style is unequal, and in general it is *biblical*, redolent with Semitisms and heavily indebted to LXX. If he reworked the Greek of his sources, it was not to make an impression in literary circles but for purely practical reasons. His quotations from profane sources seem to be mainly at second-hand.

Two examples illustrate the shaky inferences drawn from classical parallels with Acts. The Lystra incident (Acts 14:10-11) has been compared with Ovid's story of Baucis and Philemon—yet there is complete divergence of detail—place, setting, central point, and motif. The Areopagus discourse (Acts 18) is also cited as proof of Paul's dependence on Greek literature and philosophy. However, nothing in the discourse goes beyond philosophical commonplaces, or demands more than a nodding acquaintance with Greek literature and philosophy.—G. G.

210. W. PRENTICE, "St. Paul's Journey to Damascus," *ZNW** 64 ('56) 250-255.

In the Acts there are three accounts of the conversion of Paul, one related by Luke and two others in speeches ascribed to the Apostle. Gal 1:15-17 gives the direct narrative of Paul himself. From this Epistle one could gather that on his way to Damascus Saul became convinced his persecution was unjust, and that he then went off to Arabia, which would enable him to get rid of the Jewish agents who accompanied him on his journey to Damascus. Different from this simple account is the narrative of Acts 9 which contains miraculous elements. "Evidently the Christians of the first or second century could not believe that such a change as that which took place in the ideas of St. Paul could have occurred without a miracle of some sort." While the account of Acts 9 is substantially repeated in the speeches of Paul (Acts 22:1-21; 26:12-19), one should remember that these are not real speeches of the Apostle; Luke is following the custom of ancient historians, who did not pretend to relate actual speeches

but composed what they believed their characters would have said or what was fitting for the occasion. "Consequently, all that we really know about St. Paul's journey to Damascus is what we learn, or can infer, from that very summary passage of Galatians 1:15-17: All the rest is popular legend."—J. J. C.

211. J. A. T. ROBINSON, "The Most Primitive Christianity of All?" *JTS** 7 ('56) 177-189.

A comparison of the early speeches in Acts shows they are not fundamentally homogeneous. The Christology of Acts 3, with reflections in Acts 7, seems to be more primitive than that of Acts 2. Jesus is the Messiah to come; but He has already appeared, as the forerunner of the Christ He is to be, in the promised role of Servant and Prophet. The age of renewal is still to dawn and God will send Jesus, this time as the appointed Messiah. The speech of Acts 2 represents a later Christology, which recognizes the death and exaltation of Jesus as the act of God that inaugurates His kingdom. It is *by virtue of the Resurrection* that Jesus is Lord and Christ. Acts 2:36 fairly summarizes the established apostolic preaching but in many respects is not typical.

Probably the two positions represent not chronological stages but conflicting estimates of the Christ-event. Certain features of language ('Christ' and 'Lord' in Acts 2; 'Prophet' and 'Servant' in Acts 3) go some way to confirm the priority, in theology if not in time, of the latter speech. The clear inconsistency found in Acts 3:18, "that his Christ should suffer," is explained as an exegetical interpolation made by Luke. The theology of Acts 3 lies embedded in the book "like the fossils of a by-gone age." It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that the kind of thinking it represented was thenceforward extinct. It is of crucial importance for the rise of the parousia doctrine, unprecedented in Judaism, that the Christ was to come not only once but twice.—J. A. McE.

212. C. S. C. WILLIAMS, "Important and Influential Foreign Books: Martin Dibelius' 'Studies in Acts'," *ExpT** 67 ('56) 343-345.

The translation of Dibelius' *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* brings to English readers some essays which have influenced scholars since the first essay appeared in 1923. Repetitions appear in the collection but the essay on the date and authorship of the Acts has been omitted. Dibelius' approach was always form-criticism: the book of the Acts is a literary-theological document, and historical only to the extent that it casts light on the needs of the Christian community of 90 A.D. Many of the essays are outdated. The Areopagus Speech, Acts 17, is represented in three essays as unhistorical and a symbol of Christian theology in the environment of Greek culture; this theory has been refuted recently by Gärtner. The essay on the text of the Acts gives conjectural reasons for textual emendations but overlooks western papyri, the Chester Beatty papyrus, and the work of scholars which preceded the publication of this essay. The essay on the apostolic council classifies the council as a literary rendition and not as a historical event; this essay overlooks argu-

ments from the careful studies of Lake, Porter, and Manson which support the historicity of this council. Dibelius disregards the work of Dodd and Reicke and maintains that the main object of the Acts is not to relate history but to preach and to show what Christian belief is and what effects it has. He maintains that Stephen's speech is irrelevant in Acts 7, an opinion which is held by many, but fails to take into account arguments on the other side. He assumes that Luke treated his material with complete freedom and had no objective norm or restraint in recounting historical words and deeds. Ramsay's view probably is more acceptable: the references in the Acts to people and places have great historical value; the questions of historicity cannot be separated from those of literary and theological exegesis; form-criticism is a literary, not a historical, instrument and cannot be used for the final verdict on any section of the NT.—R. E. V.

EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL

213. L. A. BARRERA, "Cristologia paulina segun Cerfaux," *VyL* No. 58 ('56) 135-141.

For Cerfaux the central point in the Christ of St. Paul is the resurrected Christ. It is otherwise for Prat, Bonsirven, and Bover. According to Cerfaux, St. Paul presents the resurrected Christ as the head of a new life and the author of salvation. In Christ's triumph the apostle includes two steps: Christ's personal resurrection and the resurrection of the dead. For living men there must be a transformation into the living image of the glorious Christ. Thus the parousia of Christ becomes actual in the present Christian life. This transformation is not the only object of Christians; their faith and hope orientate them to the future life. The resurrected Christ is a pledge of the Christian's resurrection. Paul in Romans and 1 Corinthians rejects the justice of Judaism and the wisdom of Hellenism. Christ is our grace and our wisdom and also our sanctification, brought about by participation in the mystery of Christ eternal, the unifier, the recapitulator, and the savior: cf. three Pauline hymns (1 Tm 3:16, Phil 2:6-11, Col 1:15-20), the various titles given to Christ, and His divinity. The book ends in refutation of those who affirm that Paul's Christology is only an oriental syncretism.—E. H. and L. Md.

214. D. BOYER, "Jerusalem to Rome in the Path of St. Paul," *NatGeo* 110 ('56) 707-759.

With the life of Paul as the motif, B leads the reader by pictures and comments along the path of Paul as it looks today. Also offered is a map that traces Bible history on a modern background.—P. K. H.

215. J. J. COLLINS, "Bulletin of the New Testament: the Pauline Epistles," *TS* 17 ('56) 531-548.

C gives a summary of recent articles on Paul and his epistles and calls particular attention to the following. J. Munck's *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte*

is a book which has reopened all the major questions on the apostle and his teaching and has elicited several lengthy review articles. In a study on the Mystical Body Père Benoit, modifying an earlier position, shows that the doctrine is contained essentially in 1 Corinthians and Romans and given further development in Ephesians and Colossians. Two well-known texts have received fresh treatment. The familiar words of Rom 5:12, which the Vulgate translates "in quo omnes peccaverunt," receive from Fr. Lyonnet, an interpretation different from the one commonly found in Catholic theological manuals. Finally, for the puzzling text 1 Cor 7:36-38 F. Kuemmel suggests that the man and his virgin are a betrothed couple whose rights and duties Paul explains partly according to Jewish and partly according to Christian pre-suppositions.—J. J. C. (Author)

216. J. COPPENS, "L'état présent des études pauliniennes," *ETL* 32 ('56) 363-372.

During the first quarter of this century Catholic scholars were preoccupied with defending the essentials of Christianity against liberal theologians and modernist exegetes. Prat's *Théologie de S. Paul* was the most effective and enduring work. Although remarkably erudite for its time, it is criticized today for presenting Paul's thought in modern theological dress without a sense of history; its philological analyses buttress preconceived positions rather than serve as points of departure for investigation.

Today the methods and perspectives on critical research of Catholics have changed noticeably. They attach less importance to literary problems, an undeniable weakness. Heb is no longer attributed to Paul. Here a new *status quaestionis* has emerged and scholars tacitly agree that the replies of the Biblical Commission given much earlier no longer bind completely. Catholics no longer try to prove the authenticity of the Pastorals, accepting them as in the spirit of Paul if not the letter. The Captivity Epistles are authentic. In place of the liberal view of Paul, a Hellenist who recast Christianity in the forms of Greek thought, modern Catholics speak of Paul of Jerusalem whose mind was formed in the rabbinical schools with peripheral contact with Hellenism and Stoicism.

Paul's receptiveness to the influence of milieu and religious experience is the most revolutionary assertion of the new school. His theology passed through three successive phases. In the first the faith of the primitive Christian community influenced 1 and 2 Thes: through His resurrection Christ is the Lord and Messiah; the Christian is called to obey the commandments; the Church is the people of God, a limited participation on earth of the heavenly kingdom. In the second phase Paul's life of intense union with Christ and his experience in founding Churches influenced Romans, Galatians, and 1 and 2 Corinthians: Christ has become the Son of God and of the Spirit; the Church is the Mystical Body. In the third phase Jewish apocalyptic movements and "Qumranism" influenced Philipians, Colossians and Ephesians: Christ is the image of God,

the ineffable celestial King who antedates creation; the Christian is a pilgrim to the heavenly city, is already a citizen of a transcendent kingdom, a companion of angels and saints; the Church is the celestial city for which one strives. The traditional role assigned to the Christophany near Damascus was exaggerated, perhaps even false. Only Paul's vocation, to know the glorious mission of the Servant of Yahweh, was revealed there. The traditional view, that the mystic identity of the Christians and Christ also was revealed at that time, is less convincing.—M. D. Z.

217. L. JOHNSON, "The Pauline Letters from Caesarea," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 24-26.

A stichometrical analysis of the Acts shows that the closing pages which probably describe the trial and death of Paul have been lost and that 28:30-31 has been displaced from its original position after 24:26 in order to patch up a more or less plausible ending for the book. The two year sojourn in Rome has no support, then, and Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and 2 Timothy most probably were written in Caesarea. This hypothesis is supported by the historical accounts recorded or insinuated in the Acts and the Epistles and from proposed dates of their composition. Objections adduced from 2 Tm 1:17 and 4:16 can be answered adequately and do not seem to refute the opinion.—R. E. V.

218. O. Kuss, "Die Formel 'durch Christus' in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen," *TTZ* 65 ('56) 193-201.

An examination of the context of the formula "through Christ" (or its equivalent), which occurs twenty-seven times in the principal Pauline Epistles, reveals that the majority of instances arrange themselves into two categories with respect to theological meaning. Several places in Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians strongly indicate the salutary work of Christ, who by His death and resurrection has laid the foundation for the sanctity of the faithful, making them sons of God and victors over sin. The cross of Christ stands midway between Adam, whose sin it repairs, and the Last Judgment, where the faithful are saved from the wrath of God. The final judgment is the last act of God working through Christ in the world which He created through the pre-existing Christ.

The second class of references emphasizes the pneumatic Christ, acting as the unceasing wellspring of the new life of the faithful. It is the glorified Christ who acts as consoler and through whom praise is given to God, grace is preserved, God's plans are fulfilled, and the baptized are crucified to the world. It is the glorified Christ who is the source of Paul's apostolic spirit; it is Christ through whom he has been called, through whom he converts and instructs.

Although one or the other theological sense seems to be in the ascendancy in most passages, there are others in which both seem to be equally implied. Moreover, the formula is used by Paul sometimes in a causal sense, where

Christ is said to act in community with the Father as the source of the new life; and sometimes in an instrumental sense, where Christ's office of mediator is emphasized.—J. B. K.

219. D. E. LANGE, "Paul et l'Histoire du Salut," *Irenikon* 29 ('56) 277-287.

Johannes Munck, *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (1954) follows the thesis of O. Cullmann which portrays Paul as conscious of an eschatological role: the salvation of the Jews and that of the pagans is one. The Jews should be saved by emulation of the salvation of the pagans. Modern critics who see Paul as a roving missionary neglect the biblical concept of Paul's mission which is unique. His mission ranks with Peter's mission to the Jews.

M rejects the idea of the Tübingen school that Paul had rediscovered the universalism of Jesus in opposition to Peter and James. He attacks the validity of their method which interprets Paul by hypothetical second century documents. Paul should be interpreted by what he says of himself. This is also the attitude of many other modern exegetes, particularly among the Scandinavians.

In regard to controverted texts, M considers that Gal 6:13 is speaking of converts from paganism who were instilled with a false zeal for circumcision. The hypothesis that converted Jews from Jerusalem were trying to submit Pauline communities to the jurisdiction of Jerusalem is without foundation. The first Epistle to the Corinthians offers no solid reason for maintaining the existence of conflicting parties. Paul's reprehension of the Corinthians is for their pagan idea of making the preachers of the gospel masters of wisdom. His task is to show the unanimity that prevails between the mother church and the communities he has founded. He seeks the salvation of the Jews.

The exegesis of M does not solve all the difficulties; sometimes it is not entirely convincing. His view, however, is coherent and satisfying, a grandiose synthesis. Paul appears more than ever as the great apostle.—J. L. M.

220. E. BEAUCAMP, "Grâce et fidélité," *BiViChrét* 15 ('56) 58-65.

In ancient times letters began with an address enumerating the author's—and his correspondents'—titles. Thus, the main ideas here developed are: Paul the apostle of Christ, and the Church at Corinth, (1 Cor 1:2-9). To the Church at Corinth, part of the newly elected people of God, called to sanctity and bearing the responsibility of salvation with all Christians, Paul wishes "grace," the blossoming of God's gift, and "peace," the ending of the anguish of this life. Vv. 4 and 5 form a hymn of thanksgiving and of triumph with Christ. The word "testimony" in v. 6 represents the good news and its fruitful effects, but salvation is not realized therein. There is no need (as in the OT) of awaiting a future salvation, for potential salvation is at hand. Its realization has already begun (v. 7). Though the Christian already possesses firmness in Christ, (v. 8) he is still threatened, and to reach Judgment day without reproach, he must be Christlike in spirit. To God's fidelity the fidelity of Christians must respond (v. 9).—Bb.

221. E. F. F. BISHOP, "The Risen Christ and the Five Hundred Brethren (1 Cor 15,6)," *CBQ* 18 ('56) 341-344.

There are many divergent interpretations of this collective experience, especially regarding the site of the appearance and the people present. Alford holds that the site is Jerusalem and reasons from the size of this large assemblage. Swete, for the same reason, is inclined to place the appearance on the wider expanse of the Galilean hills. Robertson and Plummer seek to identify this appearance with that of Mt 28:16, while C. T. Craig, in the *Interpreter's Bible*, considers it another version of what Luke reports in Acts 2. B identifies it with the Mt 28 appearance in Galilee and, with Dalman, even suggests Mount Tabor as the most accessible and appropriate site. B enumerates the individuals and groups that would have gathered, showing that it would not be at all difficult to make the Galilean number up to five hundred and above. St. Paul must have met some of these witnesses on his journey up to Jerusalem. By the time he wrote to the Corinthians with this reference to the "five hundred and above" he says that the majority were still alive. There is here a double implication—that he knew many of the "survivors" and that in his Corinthian ministry he made use of this superlative proof of the truth of those things that were "most surely believed." Here, possibly, is a partial background to the section of the third Gospel, where St. Luke's evidence is independent of the other two Evangelists.—J. J. M.

222. M. RAEDER, "Vikariatstaufe in I Cor 15:29?" *ZNW** 46 ('56) 258-260.

"Baptism for the dead" has puzzled exegetes for centuries, and the Fathers state that among the heretics a baptized person, acting the part of a deceased unbaptized friend, actually received the rite. According to many exegetes, Paul, without approving of the practice, would argue that at least the practice implies belief in the resurrection. This text of Paul, however, has been misunderstood: Paul never argues *e concessis*. The preposition *hyper* (for) has a final meaning, and furthermore, the "baptized" are those entering the Church. Thus, the text would mean: What then would they do who have themselves baptized for the dead? (i.e. in order to be united in the resurrection with their deceased relatives and friends who had received Christian baptism?).—J. J. C.

223. T. LING, "A Note on 1 Corinthians ii. 8," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 26.

"The rulers of this world" is more probable than "spirit powers" as a translation of *archon* in 1 Cor 2:8. Arguments from OT and NT usage and better agreement with primitive Christian thought support this opinion. This translation is also preferable because it indicates a point of Pauline teaching about human nature: the natural man is blind to the ultimate character of his worldly activities, which was true in the case of the death of the Son of God.—R. E. V.

224. A. FEUILLET, "La Demeure céleste et la Destinée des Chrétiens (II Cor., V. 1-10), (suite et fin)," *RSR* 44 ('56) 360-402.

The pericope refers clearly to two data of the NT: Christ's words concerning

the Temple, and the contrast established by Paul between the earthly and celestial Adam. Both texts envisage the risen and glorious Christ. Further, the heavenly abode is the glorious body of Christians, but only as they are included virtually in the body of the Savior which alone is actually present in heaven. Hence, the heavenly abode is the glorious body of Christ to the extent that it virtually includes the glorious body of all Christians.

F's exegesis explains the immediate context with emphasis on the verbs *echomen* and *ependusasthai*, the parenthesis in v. 3, dwelling near the Savior, and the perspective of judgment in v. 10.—F. R. A.

225. W. ARNDT, "Galatians—A Declaration of Christian Liberty," *CTM** 27 ('56) 673-692.

It must be granted that Jesus nowhere in the words handed down to us makes a statement that the Mosaic code with its many regulations would no longer be in force in the coming era. That the position of the Judaizers is erroneous becomes evident in the revelation made to Peter (Acts 10). This was confirmed when Paul went to Jerusalem (Gal 2:1 ff.; Acts 11:30; 12:25); it is proclaimed in Gal. No commandment is binding now unless it is stated to have eternal validity in the NT. Luther held that Paul teaches freedom from the whole Law. Certainly the fundamental error of Paul's opponents was that righteousness can and must be achieved by our good works. Paul does not mean that what the moral law declared sinful is no longer sinful for the Christian; he states that in the Christian the doing of God's will is accomplished not through the Law but through the Holy Spirit.—J. O'R.

226. D. GUTHRIE, "Tertullian and Pseudonymity," *ExpT** 67 ('56) 341-342.

Mitton cites Tertullian as a witness to the legitimacy of pseudonymity in the authorship of Eph (*ExpT** 67 ['56] 197). An investigation of Tertullian's testimony indicates that this hypothesis is incorrect. Mitton's own theory on the origin of Ephesians involves a different proposition from that of Tertullian.—R. E. V.

227. C. CLARE OKE, "A Doxology not to God but Christ," *ExpT** 67 ('56) 367-368.

The passage of 1 Tm 1:17 "Now to the King of the ages, immortal, invisible, alone divine, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen" is invariably conceived as having God the Father in mind. But a careful study of the pericope points rather to a doxology addressed to Christ. First, one should notice, what is often overlooked, that *theos*, ordinarily translated "God," lacks an article, and such nouns without an article stress rather the quality and character of an object and become almost equivalent to an adjective. The phrase then would have the meaning "alone divine," and the author of 1 Timothy, having Christ in mind would mean not that rather than the Father Christ is alone divine, but that in comparison with all other beings human or angelic He is solely divine,

of the same nature and character as God Himself. Other terms also, though true of the Father, can be used of Christ. Thus the title "King of the ages" occurs frequently in Hebrew prayers referring to God, but it is naturally applied to Christ who wages a successful war against the powers of evil until all the enemies are put under His feet. Furthermore immortality and incorruption are predicated of Jesus in 2 Tm 1:10 where He is portrayed as One "who has emasculated the (supreme enemy) Death and disclosed life and immortality through the gospel."—J. J. C.

228. H. H. HOHENSTEIN, "A Study of Hebrews 6:4-8," *CTM** 27 ('56) 433-444; 536-546.

The writer does not accuse the Hebrew Christians of the apostasy which he depicts; he warns them against this fall. *Hapax* here means "once for all"; the *photisthentas* are the converted rather than the baptized; the "good word of promise" is the very power by which God establishes communion with men and thereby projects the blessings of what is to come into what is now. The apostasy here described is the sin against the Holy Ghost (Mt 12:31-32; Mk 3:22-30; Lk 12:10); otherwise the passage contradicts the numerous statements regarding the possibility of conversion. Thus it is possible for Christians to fall irrevocably. The cause of such apostasy lies wholly in the wicked will of the apostate. When the Scriptures speak of the God who hardens, this process is no pretemporal and inflexible decree, but the result of a stubborn rejection of Christ. A second conversion can, however, be effected by the Lord.—J. O'R.

CATHOLIC EPISTLES, APOCALYPSE

229. W. C. VAN UNNIK, "Christianity according to I Peter," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 78-83.

Is 1 Peter a letter? A modern tendency considers it a baptismal sermon divided into two parts, but no cogent arguments have been given as yet. As a letter it must be considered in its historical setting. The sufferings mentioned in the letter are not linked to the persecutions by the state. They came from ill-tempered neighbors, who resented the Christians not sharing their way of living. The readers of the Epistle were newly converted pagans. This is shown in 2:25, 2:10, 1:18, and especially in the salutation whose wording recalls Ex 24. Furthermore, many expressions of the Epistle closely parallel those used among the Jews in connection with proselytes. The converts had been redeemed by the blood of the Lamb Christ. But now their faith has been put on trial. They must endure because they belong to a new nation expecting the great inheritance. How should they live? Their conversion must bring a change of life, since Christianity is not a set of ideas, but a way of life. The Epistle deals with a situation threatening the whole Christian life. Yet there is joy: The time of suffering is short, but the fulfillment of hope will come. The Resurrection of Christ is not only an example for Christians, but also the firm ground

of their faith. The life of the Christian is well summed up in 3:8. It is a life of "good works," which is not a selection of mannerisms, but a manner of life according to the highest standards of human behavior, stamped by the fear of God and implying humility in accordance with the OT. The principle of this letter still bears application today.—J. F. B.

230. I. DE LA POTTERIE, "‘Le péché, c’est l’iniquité’ (I Joh., III, 4)," *NRT* 78 ('56) 785-797.

Most exegetes translate *anomia* by lawlessness. However there is no reference to the law in the context. While in classical Greek *anomia* usually means transgression of the law, in biblical Greek it becomes a mere synonym of *hamartia*, sin. This second meaning is not acceptable in 1 Jn 3:4 since it would amount to a tautology. In the NT and in early Christian writings, *anomia* takes a third meaning: iniquity. Iniquity is a spiritual state of hostility against Christ, submission to Satan, exclusion from the Messianic kingdom. It has a definite eschatological flavor. This meaning is the correct one in 1 Jn 3:4. It fits perfectly with the context 1 Jn 3:1-10, in which John contrasts the sons of God with the sons of the devil. John's use of *anomia* emphasizes the theological and religious essence of sin, rather than its moral aspect.—F. V.

231. A. GEORGE, "Un appel à la fidélité, Les Lettres aux Sept Eglises d'Asie," *BiViChrét* 15 ('56) 80-86.

This work was written during the reign of Domitian when the Christian martyrs emerged as victors out of the Roman persecution. The Seven Letters are constructed similarly and include an address of the glorious Christ to a local church, a judgment on the local situation, and a promise to the "victorious." They constitute a bloc with central notions closely linked to the main theme of the book. The Seven Churches to which they are addressed are not symbolical. Abundant proof can be offered to show that they are real. John is preoccupied with the life of these communities and wishes to convey the message that Christ will appear in triumph, bearing the features described by the prophets, and will judge the churches on their faith and charity. It is a summons to greater fidelity and love.—Bb.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

232. A. BEA, "Valeur Pastorale de la Parole de Dieu dans la Liturgie," *La Maison-Dieu* Nos. 47-48 ('56) 127-148.

The mind of the Church as regards the pastoral role of the word of God in the holy liturgy may be found in a threefold domain: (1) in that of history and its teachings; (2) in theological research on the nature and efficacy of the word of God; (3) in the union between biblical reading and the eucharistic sacrifice.

From these three considerations will flow an important consequence for the priest who is both minister of the word and minister of the Sacrament.

(1) Before instituting the Holy Eucharist the Master spoke on humility and charity. Immediately after the institution of the Sacrament and the first offering of the eucharistic sacrifice, Jesus made His sublime discourse of farewell. On this memorable night the Savior created the model for the principal liturgical function of His Church: the intimate union of the word of God and the sacrificial act. Based on this model, the liturgico-sacrificial reunions became little by little the principal and ordinary occasion for the religious instruction of the faithful and even of the catechumens. The Church then began to cultivate with particular solicitude this branch of its pastoral function.

It is significant that the plan—biblical reading, explanation, eucharistic sacrifice—is already found in the first really complete description of the liturgical assemblies of the faithful. Today the union of these three elements is quite familiar to us. The facts of religious history show that this union is a property characteristic of Catholic cult.

(2) The holy Books do not merely contain the word of God—they *are* the word of God; and therefore Holy Scripture possesses a very particular inherent force and pastoral authority. Consequently, every initiative to make the holy Books known, read, meditated, and employed is worthy of high praise and encouragement.

(3) The word of God possesses unparalleled efficacy by reason of its own virtue and is reinforced by its union with the eucharistic sacrifice. The particular divine grace which comes from this mystical union is an element more important and decisive than all others. The mystical union between the word of God and the Bread of Life, which we extol in the liturgy, brings out a double task for the priest. He is the minister of the word as well as the minister of the Sacrament. In him, therefore, the word of God ought to become as flesh of his flesh, spirit of his spirit, in the same manner as the eucharistic bread. In him the liturgical movement and the biblical movement ought to meet, blend, and compenetrates.

Two tables are said to be placed in the treasury of the Church: the table of the holy altar where the consecrated bread is found, and the table of the divine law which contains the holy doctrine and teaches the true faith. It is the lofty end of the liturgical reform to make ever more accessible to the faithful the two tables which God Himself has given us.—J. G. C.

233. J. BONSIRVEN, "La Constitution Sociale du Règne de Dieu—I," *RAscMys* 125 ('56) 3-32.

When compared with the prescriptions of the OT and the rabbinic counsels, the maxims of Jesus concerning relations with the neighbor go far beyond the social code of Israelitic theocracy; they affirm the primacy of love and of the interior in the universal, spiritual kingdom of God. Christian love is revealed to be a participation in the merciful love of God as manifested in the generous,

patient love of the Incarnate Word. Love of neighbor is referred to the love of God (Mk 12:28), and the term *neighbor* has a new, non-national, universal sense (Lk 10:30 ff.). As in the positive form of the golden rule (Mt 7:12), replacing the negative rabbinical form, legal conceptions yield the primacy to love. The attitude toward the neighbor should be that of God's mercy (goodness and beneficence); the Last Judgment will regard works of mercy (Mt 25:35), the Lord Himself being identified with the unfortunate. Pharisaical judgment is condemned (Mt 12:7), fraternal correction carefully explained and qualified (Mt 18:15; 7:3). Forgiveness is repeatedly commanded, mercy will be shown the merciful, peacemakers are blessed and the meek will inherit the Messianic kingdom. While Jesus simplified the moral commandment of the OT and of the rabbinic sentences, inspiring it with more lofty motivation, He far surpasses the OT horizons by His reversal of the *lex talionis* (Mt 5:38) and His counsel patiently to conquer evil by good. Especially is this so in the ideal of love (Jn 15:13) which He proposes as a new commandment and as His own.—W. J. R.

234. J. BONSIIVEN, "La Constitution Sociale du Règne de Dieu—II," *RAscMys* 127 ('56) 257-283.

For the perfection of love Jesus inculcated the doctrine of fidelity to the primacy of the interior. It is the interior that defiles (Mk 7:20; Mt 15:18); thus, His rebuke of the Pharisees (Lk 11:39). Contrary to some rabbinic teaching, there may be interior sin without external act (Mt 5:27). The parable of the enlightening eye (Mt 6:22) teaches the need of fidelity to the interior source of light. Parallel to such illuminating simplicity is purity of heart (Mt 5:8), a positive interior purity (comprehending rectitude and justice—Lk 11:41; Jn 13:10; 15:3) which goes beyond the external ritualistic purity of the OT (Ps 24:4), and to which is promised the vision of God in faith. Such purity of heart realizes the plenitude of the interior, excludes hypocrisy in all forms, demands purity of intention in almsgiving, prayers, and good works (Mt 6:1-6), assures the publican's humility (Lk 18:9) and justice before God (cf. Lk 16:14). To this interior purity and simplicity should be referred the teaching on oaths (Mt 5:33), the statement concerning divorce (Mt 19:9, interpreting *porneia* as indicating a simulated marriage), and the command to render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's (Mk 12:17). They insure the primacy of love and the primacy of the interior, indispensable for the renewal of human society.—W. J. R.

235. A. CABANISS, "Wisdom 18:14 f.: an Early Christmas Text," *ViCh* 10 ('56) 97-102.

The use of this text from Wisdom in the Christmas liturgy reveals the artistic genius of the person who first applied the description of the avenging angel's descent upon Egypt to the mighty leap of the "almighty Word" in the "quiet silence" from the "royal throne" of heaven down to earth. It also indicates that

by the end of the first century some rudimentary liturgical celebration of Christmas existed. While the accounts of the Nativity in Mt 1:18-2:12 and Lk 1:26-56; 2:1-20 indicate early interest in Christ's birth, Ap 12 with its mystical retelling of the story reveals the probability of some liturgical celebration of Christmas as early as the beginning of the second century. Additional evidence is supplied by Ti 3:4 and 2:11 as well as by Heb 10:5-7 and 1 Tm 3:16. The text from Wisdom with its Nativity application lurks in the background of Bishop Ignatius of Antioch's epistle to the Ephesians, ch. 19. The parallel is not merely verbal; there is a similarity in the sequence of ideas. Thus, we may conclude that the Ignatian epistle reflects Wis 18:14 f., which was already in use as a liturgical Christmas text. Ap 12 may be an early indication of the application of the text to the Nativity, so that Dix's rejection of a Christmas celebration before the third century must be questioned. Furthermore, the testimony of *Liber Pontificalis*, that Pope Telesphorus (martyred A.D. 130) ordained that the Angels' Hymn should be used only before the Mass on Christmas night, receives added support as evidence of an early liturgical Proper of the Time.—J. F. Br.

236. R. E. CUSHMAN, "Barth's Attack upon Cartesianism and the Future in Theology," *JR** 36 ('56) 207-223.

Where are we going in theology? Tillich sees a perceptible drift back to the anthropocentric, experiential method of Schleiermacher away from the Christocentric view of Barth. Tillich favors the existential approach based on anthropology and monistic ontology. He hopes to gain a two-fold end, to demythologize by rational anthropology the Christian world philosophy, and to avoid a head-on clash with a scientific world view which sees divine causality through revelation as a scandal.

Barth in opposing the anthropological view espouses realism in epistemology. He warns that the immanent causality of Descartes and Schleiermacher imprisons one within his own experience. Man exists not abstractly but concretely, in determinations of his existence by objects external to himself.

For Barth the object of theological reflection is the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the Word made flesh and appropriated in faith. The starting point is the sovereign freedom of God with man as the object of gracious divine activity in creation and redemption. Revelation is entirely the work of grace.

Has Barth denatured man in his jealousy for God's initiative in creation and redemption? Man retains the power to resist grace. Man's real existence is in faith in Jesus Christ. Through Jesus Christ the Holy Spirit reveals to us what man should be, and what man actually is, a creature in rebellion to his own nature. Through faith in Christ, in the power of the Holy Spirit, the resistance of other men is replaced by readiness for God. Jesus Christ is the point of decisive divine break-through into the circle of mere human self-understanding.

The theologian must decide in what form he will entertain the divine causality. Will he follow Tillich and Schleiermacher and settle for a theory of

immanent causality whose ultimate concern is the higher self-consciousness of man? Or will he follow Barth and regard the divine causality as the effectual word spoken by the Holy Spirit?—J. O'N.

237. J. DANIELOU, "Les Quatre-Temps de septembre et la fête des Tabernacles," *La Maison-Dieu* No. 46 ('56) 114-136.

Only Jn 7:2 mentions the Feast of Tabernacles explicitly. But numerous allusions in the Gospels refer to the rites of the feast, the chanting of Ps 118, etc. The feast is highly Messianic in character (Jn 7-8) and eschatological (Ap 21-22), as attested in the Judaism of our Lord's time. The details surrounding the triumphal entry into Jerusalem and the discourses that follow fit the Feast of Tabernacles in September better than the Pasch. Why has such an important feast for the early Christians left no trace in the liturgy? Why have the Evangelists (save Jn 7-8) situated the feast chronologically at different times of the year? P. Carrington has shown how the Gospels are divided into sections which were read during the liturgical year. Mk followed the ancient sacerdotal calendar (as shown by Miss Jaubert). Readings, beginning with the baptism of Jesus and ending with the triumphal entry and the separate paschal sections, went from September to September. The entry into Jerusalem was recalled at the time of Tabernacles. Jn, however, as a reaction against the Judaeo-Christians still attached to Jewish feasts and customs, transposed the events of the entry to the Sunday before the Pasch, the central liturgical feast. He stressed the Resurrection against the temporal Messianic expectations which affected even Christians in the form of millenarianism. But the chief reason for the change seems to be Jn's following the Jewish legal year which began in April. His liturgical year consequently went from Easter to Easter, with the triumphal entry being recalled in April. In the Graeco-Roman world the liturgical readings were rearranged to fit the legal year which began Jan. 1. Easter could not be changed, and the readings from September to Easter were shortened necessarily by three months. Readings dealing with Tabernacles, however, were lengthened in the same way for the final three months of the Roman year. Themes of Tabernacles were transferred to the Epiphany in the East. At Rome a solemn fast at the time of the new moon in September coincided with Tabernacles, whose readings were kept. This is the connection of ember days in September and Tabernacles. When Epiphany was introduced from the East and Palm Sunday from Jerusalem, the Feast of Tabernacles was thus recalled three times.—R. J. C.

238. F. DANKER, "Faith Without Works," *CTM** 27 ('56) 513-535.

Gal 2-4 teaches that all Christians acknowledge the insufficiency of Law as a criterion of righteousness by their acceptance of Christ. Law cannot assist in the attainment of a God-pleasing life. Christ is the only answer, for He liberates from what is responsible for transgressions. Law for St. Paul means a criterion according to which a man aims to judge his relationship with God. Faith with-

out works means the rejection of all except Christ's atoning work. Inasmuch as the Sacraments are the means employed by the Spirit to dispense the fruits of Christ's atonement, those who reject them are actually putting man back under the Law. Christian ethics becomes a real possibility only by association with Jesus. The sanctification of the Christian is not a criterion of his relationship with God but the result of his complete restoration to God. Faith not producing good works is not faith.—J. O'R.

239. A. R. DULLES, "Paul Tillich and the Bible," *TS* 17 ('56) 345-367.

T's biblical doctrine may be set forth under three headings. (1) The Bible is the primary source of the preparatory revelations given to the Jews and of the final revelation given in Jesus as the Christ. The Bible achieves revelatory power by employing symbols which manifest God as the ground of being. (2) The Bible is a document of the history of religion insofar as it records the reception of the revelation by the Jews (including the biblical authors themselves). Under this aspect it is not an inspired work and should be subjected to historical criticism. (3) The Bible is the basic font of Christian theology. The positive norm of theology—namely, the appearance of God in Jesus as the Christ—is derived from the Bible in its encounter with the Church; the theologian's task is to seek out what concerns us ultimately in the biblical picture of Jesus as the Christ, and to present it in a way adapted to the needs of his own day. In modern times theology must attempt to grasp the ontological implications of the Christian message.

T's biblical doctrine contains many valuable elements—notably his refutation of biblicism, his analysis of the role of biblical theology, and his critique of a spurious supernaturalism which would deny to natural causes their proper role and dignity. But T's philosophical premises lead him into an unwarranted rejection of all supernaturalism. On his own principles he cannot account for the essential connection between the Christian revelation and the historical events recorded in the Bible.—A. R. D. (Author)

240. J. HAROUTUNIAN, "The Doctrine of the Ascension." *Interpretation** 10 ('56) 270-281.

The Ascension, though indispensable in our redemption, has not aroused the devotion and reflection given to other aspects of Christ's mission; and yet the Ascension helps us think more correctly of the descent and Incarnation. It presupposes the Father in Heaven, in the locus of His Being, exalted above all creation and still working with all creation by His Spirit and by His Son. If the Resurrection is separated from the Ascension the gospel becomes mythology; for there is no joy, no faith, no hope, no "realized eschatology," no fulfillment of promises, no eternal life, unless we are saved by His life, by His Ascension to Heaven, whence by the Spirit He binds us to the Father. Without the Ascension there is no reign, no glory, no king, no prophet, no priest acting for us.—F. J. R.

241. L. JOHNSTON, "The Spirit of God," *Scripture* 8 ('56) 65-74.

Religion is the union of God with man. God's plan for realizing this union can be clearly traced in the development of the idea of the gift of God's spirit, from its original anthropomorphic OT sense of the 'breath of God' to its final revelation as a divine Person and the very life-principle of God's Church. Life, activity, sanctity—such is the rôle of the spirit in God and such are the gifts it gives to man to forward his union with God. God "sends forth His spirit and all things are created." The spirit descends on kings and prophets and gives them a share in God's activity. It gives the holiness necessary for union with a holy God. Isaiah portrays it as a 'burning spirit', Ezechiel as a 'mighty wind'. The new era dawns and the spirit is poured forth once more in wind and flame, the breath of God's life and the fire of His holiness. The loving God of the OT is now revealed as Love itself and His spirit is now 'the Spirit of love'. By the overshadowing of this Spirit, the union of God and man is perfected in God incarnate and is shared by all men who are united in one body, animated by this same Spirit. Through this union man is now given a much closer participation in God's life, activity, and holiness. Furthermore, this life-giving spirit is also the spirit of peace and joy, the pledge, or rather the initial possession of the new life of the resurrection.—K. K.

242. A. JONES, "The Word is a Seed," *The Bridge* 2 ('56) 13-24.

God caused the seed of revelation to flower slowly. As the biblical themes of presence, sacrifice, and temple reached their sublime maturity only in the NT, so the revelatory word of God ripened into the incarnate Word of God. The primordial word was creative, for "By the word of the Lord the heavens were made" (Ps 32:6). Here the Hebrew *dabar* (word, deed) differs from the Greek *logos* (word, reason) as much as practical revelation excels abstract philosophy. Yet more articulate were "the words of the covenant, the ten words" (Ex 34:28). Creation was supplemented by the legislative word, showing that Israel's fortune always lies in following the word, whatever form it assumes. The *debar Yahweh* was next personified, especially as Wisdom. But the Hebrew Word-Wisdom was not the Greek achievement of man but a gift of God, nourishing mankind like the later Word, the very Bread of Life. The Aramaic Targumim of Jewish tradition furthered the development by placing *memra* (word) as a Mediator between God and man, seemingly to safeguard God's transcendence while insisting on His immanence. Thus the word of God reached a stage beyond which it could not go until "the Word was made flesh." The first phrase of Jn deliberately echoes the "in the beginning" of Genesis because this Word is also creative and revelatory, a more sublime wisdom, the true Mediator.—L. J. O'T.

243. G. V. JONES, "Dreams in the New Testament," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 57-60.

Nearly all the dreams fit into dream-analysis patterns. (1) The resolution of moral conflict: perhaps the temptation of Jesus, certainly Paul's man from

Macedonia, Paul's decision to remain in Corinth, Peter's dream on admitting Gentiles. (2) Prediction: the vision of Cornelius. (3) Communication: Ananias learns about St. Paul. While these dreams, vital in their context but restrained in their expression, are part of a pattern of divine action symbolically manifesting the divine will through the unconscious mind, yet some are capable of analysis apart from being media of supernatural revelation.—T. A. J.

244. E. M. KREDEL, "Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese," *ZKT* 78 ('56) 169-193; 257-305.

At the turn of the eighteenth century NT criticism concerned itself with the traditional concept of an apostle. Since that time the picture of an apostle in modern theology has departed more and more from the old concept. Messiah, Church and apostle are so closely related that any change in the concept of one affects the others. Under the influence of eschatologism, Reimarus presented the apostles as heralds of the Messiah while Jesus was living and as future judges and co-regents of Israel at the coming of the Kingdom. Schleiermacher saw the apostles as teachers who received their first impulse from Jesus but were later independent of Him. To Harnack the apostles were wandering, charismatic preachers.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century came the period of the "Consensus." For a time no more progress was made. The greatest distance between the traditional picture of an apostle and that of the critics had been reached. The mission character of the apostolate had fallen into complete forgetfulness and the mission connection between the historical Christ and His apostles was dropped. With the publication of the *Didache* in 1883 and the consequent reaction, the discussion was renewed and an opposing movement set in. At the same time in which the apostles were denied any special position by one side (R. Sohm), they were conceded a unique plenitude of power by the other (J. Weiss). Harnack in his later editions reflects a distinct eschatological coloring.

1921 was a year of great importance for the development of a correct concept of an apostle. Kattenbusch traced the college of Twelve, as a type of the new Israel, directly back to Jesus. He considered it the instrument Jesus used to build His new *Volk der Heiligen*. Holl once more asserted the missionary character of the apostles which Harnack had rejected. Holl believed that Peter and the Twelve knew that they were the leaders of God's people. After the work of Fridrichsen and Cullmann, Protestant exegesis recognized that the apostles, by their very nature, were commissioned agents of Christ. The Catholic critical study shows that the content of this commission was not exhausted with the preaching of a message. The apostles were, in the fullest sense, personal, authorized representatives of the Good Shepherd who will remain with His flock until the second coming.—J. F. F.

245. J. MACQUARRIE, "Demonology and the Classic Idea of Atonement," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 3-6.

The rejection of the existence and role of demons, necessitated by modern explanations of much physical and mental evil, is more easily applied to the Gospels than to St. Paul, who uses mythological language to illustrate how by sin man subjected himself to creatures and thus rendered them demonic in character. The deeply imbedded demonology of the Fathers, founded on the classic idea of atonement with its ransom paid to the devil, is only partially explained in Gustave Aulen's *Christus Victor*. Perhaps the teaching of the Fathers on demonology may be successfully demythologized by Bultmann's principles, without totally discarding the bulk of their atonement teachings. This solution, which will correspond to the type of question asked, must present the existential or religious meaning of their demons and not the allegorical, psychological, literary or historical (causal) explanation.—T. A. J.

246. J. MACQUARRIE, "Demonology and the Classic Idea of Atonement," *ExpT** 68 ('56) 60-63.

A patristic example of demonology in the theory of atonement is afforded in the *De Incarnatione* and the *Vita S. Antoni* of St. Athanasius. By ambivalence of expression the cause of evil is sometimes attributed to demons, sometimes to men; man, able to turn to God or creatures, has made the latter into idols for himself; the Cross of Christ destroys the power of the evil spirits who as pagan gods usurped divine honor. By interpretation, Christ's Cross means a renunciation of the world and a surrender to God, the destruction of demons signifies the cessation of worldly attachment, and sharing in the resurrection stands for the new God-orientated life. The objectivity of demons, which are man's invention, is merely the expression of the real victory of Christ's Cross over evil. Hence Aulen's presentation may be defended by using Bultmann's principles. Bultmann's own theory of the atonement, which is very similar to the demythologized view of St. Athanasius and the classic or dramatic tradition, signifies renunciation and liberation from the powers of the world. The Anselmian view, followed by Barth and the medieval scholastics, seems to be a side-track, according to Aulen, in the history of Christian dogma.—T. A. J.

247. A. MICHEL, "La communion des saints et l'Ecriture," *Doctor Communis* 9 ('56) 7-15.

The dogma of the communion of saints has its foundation in Scripture. The doctrine, though not taught formally and explicitly, is clearly implied and can be easily traced. The Synoptics reveal the kingdom of God that unifies under the form of a community all souls adorned with sanctifying grace. This kingdom, terrestrial in its first stage of growth, finds its completion only in its heavenly fulfillment. Here on earth it is ever growing toward maturity under the continuous guidance and influx of Christ. It is primarily a spiritual kingdom; it is universal; it lists in its ranks those who freely accept grace that is

freely given. John illumines the theme of unity in Christ. His prologue and conclusion insist on Christ as the source of light and life for men. In Jn 1 the theme is more explicit. The first three verses stress the communion that is to arise. In the sacerdotal prayer Jesus insists on this union as the primary goal for all men. St. Paul in Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians develops this doctrine. He teaches, by his doctrine of the body of which Christ is the head, the central notion of communication of life and the resulting communion between Christ and the members, and between the members themselves.—J. J. M.

248. C. MOHRMANN, "Wortform und Wortinhalt. Bemerkungen zum Bedeutungswandel im altchristlichen Griechisch u. Latein," *MTZ* 7 ('56) 99-114.

Because the advent of Christianity profoundly influenced men's thinking, it produced corresponding changes in language. But these changes were always conditioned by the language system in which they arose. Latin, as a "grammatical" language, accommodated itself by taking over foreign words for exactitude and then forming regular derivatives (*evangelizare*, *evangelista*, *evangelicus*). The more "lexicological" Koine Greek, however, so isolated single words from the group as to give them alone a meaning which was sometimes almost exclusively technical. Thus *doxa* means glory, but *dokeo* keeps the usual meaning of to think or suppose; and of *kaleo*, *enkaleo*, *eiskaleo*, *metakaleo*, *prokaleo*, and *synkaleo*, only *kaleo* has a specifically Christian sense. Further, because words are not just constants in a language system, but also variables in history, some display greater flexibility than others. Thus among Christians new meanings took quick and easy possession of some words (*zoe*, *angelos*), very gradual possession of others (*eros*, *amor*); still others, heavily weighted with pagan usage (*preces*), became fixed only after centuries (when typically Christian *oratio* had become trite). Although the meaning and the form of words are in continual flux, changes are not chaotic, because the state of a word at a given instant depends on its immediate past, and all changes are conditioned by the language system in which they occur.—R. L. L.

249. J. O'ROURKE, "An Aside to the Mariological Interpretation of Genesis 3:14," *AER* 135 ('56) 227-230.

Since 1950 many authors have subscribed to the Mariological interpretation of the "woman." Does the hesitant adherence of some contribute to a morally unanimous consent? Regarding interpretation in general we cannot say that opinions really distinct and mutually exclusive contribute to establishing unanimity of thought unless they agree in censuring one other opinion. When they merely mutually exclude another opinion, they do not effect a moral unanimity. The mutually rejected opinion does not seem to be then definitively excluded.—J. O'R. (Author)

250. H. SCHLIER, "Das Neue Testament und der Mythos," *Hochland* 48 ('56) 201-212.

With regard to the dilemma—Is the New Testament history or myth?—it

seems that either the NT critics are wrong or that the NT writers have been deceived. From the Gnostics until today, critics have asserted that the burden of the NT preaching is myth, while its writers have indignantly denied the allegation (e.g. 2 Pt 1:16). As might be expected in the circumstances, both assertion and denial contain an element of truth. The NT writers correctly deny the main charge here, viz., that myth was a constitutive principle either in the genesis or the development of the NT message. From the very start Christian preaching was built squarely on the witness of men and women to individual concrete events, which—so their experience showed them—actually had formed the culminating point of the divine history of salvation. Precisely because of the foundation on which it was based, this preaching is diametrically opposed to myth, whose essence precludes it from reflecting actual history, since it is formed to express timeless, cosmic processes in symbolic story-form. The consciousness of this essential difference between myth and their preaching lies behind the rejection of myth which the NT writers insist on so trenchantly.

On the other hand, the critics are correct to this extent, that the NT has felt no embarrassment in employing contemporary myth for two purposes: first, to describe purely eschatological events, and second, to express the complete significance of the salvific history which had been gained by theological reflection. The reason for this *insouciance* in the face of the NT's abhorrence of myth is the awareness which these writers had that they were using these myths critically, i.e. not as myths. Conscious of the origin of the myths—that they expressed human dreams and presentiments of the possible ways in which God could save mankind—and convinced that God had granted what mankind had dreamed of in the historical career of Jesus of Nazareth, the inspired writers unabashedly turned to myth, in order to grasp for themselves and to convey to others the significance of the historical events which they or their forebears in the faith had witnessed. In other words, the NT rooted these myths in the history to which it bore witness, and in doing so, deprived them of their mythical character, or, to use the modern phrase, "demythologized" them. Therefore, there is no need for the exegesis of the twentieth century to devote itself to a task which has been done for it already; it had better return to its proper task which is one of translation, i.e., of grasping and expressing the reality of which the NT tells, by carefully weighing the terms in which the NT writers stated it. —J. F. C.

251. R. SPIAZZI, "Il valore sociale del Vangelo," *SacDoc* ('56) 219-234.

The gospel does not contain an earthly message. Jesus did not come to rule over the things of the earth. He came to say that we have a Father in heaven and that we are called to be the sons of God. This sonship with God has a practical consequence, brotherhood among men. It is precisely from this two-fold transcendent truth that the basic ideas of Christ's social preaching spring, viz., the dignity of man, the universality of salvation, and the spirit of poverty. These are the fundamental principles upon which all spirituality and all social

justice must rest. Because of its transcendence, this message is the only one with an adequate answer to the great social demands of our day.—F. A.

252. T. F. TORRANCE, "The Israel of God," *Interpretation** 10 ('56) 305-320.

Israel was the *qahal*, the community of the covenant with God for sacrifice, worship, and revelation. God prepared the way of covenant love, manifested His truth, and assumed Israel into a life relation with Himself to be the instrument of His self-giving to all men. God so faithfully kept the covenant that Israel inevitably suffered, for He would not allow His people, *laos*, to be *ethnos*, like other nations. Israel was one with the Suffering Servant, pointed towards the Incarnation, bound to God by the cords of His covenant, and manifesting His persistent will to bring forgiveness and reconciliation and the final union and communion of men with Himself in Jesus Christ. In Christ Israel was gathered up, fulfilled, and transcended, but it must still contribute its part to the Christian Church which has been grafted onto it. Through Israel's refusal of God in its representative capacity for all men, God's love achieved its final victory in the crucifixion. Israel incurred the wrath of God, who chastens but who does not banish, disown, or disinherit. The covenant and its promises to Israel, upon which depends the full blessing of the gentiles, remain. Israel, still the Servant of God, will find its way of restoration within its traditional and unique role of election and rejection, *laos* and *ethnos*, the one representing all and manifesting God's love for His people.—F. J. R.

253. L. WUNDERLICH, "The Holy Spirit and the Christian Life," *CTM** 27 ('56) 753-764.

Man's regeneration through the love of the Father and the vicarious atonement of the Son is ascribed to the agency of the Holy Spirit. The *anakainosis*, implying a complete change for the better, is both the mission and the accomplishment of the Holy Spirit. The Father and the Son dwell in the soul of the regenerated; it is, however, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit which is emphasized. Water is the first symbol of the indwelling; another is the seal; a third is "earnest" money. This indwelling of the Spirit is the highest motivation for an unending struggle against the fleshly sins which beset us. Sanctification is not equated with sinlessness. The indwelling Spirit enables us to be and to live as God's children. The Spirit unites believers into one body, the Church. Thus the Spirit is the divine Dynamic in the Christian's life.—J. O'R.

-
254. M.-E. BOISMARD, "Baptême et renouveau," *LumV* 27 ('56) 391-401.

B studies the Pauline texts in simple chronological order to develop three aspects of "renewal." The earliest writings emphasize a break with sin, enabling man to seek clearly the will of God. In the second group of texts, Paul explains

a deeper meaning; the newly-baptized is a "new creature," an individual pure and innocent before his Creator because his sins have been expiated by Christ. In the last and most profound texts, B stresses a universal and Christological perspective as Paul speaks of the spiritual renewal of humanity as a whole, a "new creation" of which Christ is the principle and head.—J. E. O'C.

255. J. DUPLACY, "Le baptême dans le nouveau testament," *LumV* 27 ('56) 291-336.

Prompted by current Protestant controversy over infant baptism, D reviews at length the principal baptismal texts of NT. The article, however, is not intended as a polemic refutation of non-Catholic views. The redemptive work of Christ precedes and establishes the salvation of individuals; each individual's faith is a participation in the faith of the Church. Therefore, an insistence upon personal faith as absolutely necessary for baptism forgets the role of Christ and of the Church in the salvation of men. This Protestant insistence corresponds rather with the role of faith according to the OT than to the NT and minimizes the transformation in the religious status of humanity brought about by the event of salvation.—J. E. O'C.

256. Y. B. TRÉMEL, "Le baptême incorporation du chrétien au Christ," *LumV* 27 ('56) 369-390.

T expounds key passages and principal formulas expressing Saint Paul's doctrine on baptism in terms of *insertion* into the events of salvation, death, burial, and resurrection *with* Christ. He strongly affirms a *belonging* to Christ: you have been baptized *in the name of* Jesus; you have been baptized *in* Christ.

In the history of salvation, the decisive event is the death and resurrection of Christ. In the life of every Christian, the unique act which makes him enter into the redemptive mystery is baptism. Baptism is the passage from the old man to the new, from humanity broken by sin to the new people of God. More precisely it places the sinner in the very moment when this passage takes place, it makes him contemporaneous with the death and resurrection of Christ, it plunges him into the full saving mystery.

To Paul this realism of the resurrection, or rather of the resurrected Body of Christ, is an act which enacts salvation. The expression "in Christ" summarizes the *mystique* of Paul. From a formula which signified belonging to Christ, from a rite susceptible to becoming profoundly symbolic, from the Christian faith founded on the expiatory value of the death of Jesus applied by the rite of aggregation to the community, Paul was compelled to draw together the liturgical act of the capital event of salvation and thus exploit every virtuality of the primitive faith. Not only by baptism does the Christian belong to Christ, become conformed to Him, adopted as he is by God, but he finds himself inserted into the mystery of Christ, intimately associated to His death and resurrection.—J. G. C.

257. P. BENOIT, "The Holy Eucharist: 1," *Scripture* 8 ('56) 97-108.

Mark and Paul alone give independent accounts of the institution of the Eucharist, both of which are liturgical in character. We must, therefore, look elsewhere for the historical reconstruction that will help us to see whether the Last Supper was a paschal meal and what meaning our Lord gave to it. The one serious objection to the view that it was a paschal meal is the evidence of Jn 18:28. There is still room for discussion of the problem, but we may say at least that the Last Supper was held in the atmosphere of the Pasch and that the coincidence was not unintentional. The facts we are given fit very well into the setting of the Jewish rite; the liturgical character of the accounts suffices to explain the differences. Jesus adopted and transformed the old rite into a Christian Pasch. Why? The unmistakable lesson is that He was going to give His life as a sacrifice: this much is apparent both from the rich symbolism of the bread and wine and still more from our Lord's words. Before giving the bread and wine as food, He had to give His life to the Father. This sacrifice would seal the new covenant with His blood, and thus the old covenant sealed by the blood of the lamb would be replaced. The new sacrifice was to be one of love, for Jesus was the "Servant of Yahweh" who suffered in place of His brethren, who suffered for all men in expiation. But there was more than the sacrifice: there was the new way in which the disciples were to share in it. The bread and wine were not merely rich symbols, they were food which when eaten united them with the victim of the sacrifice in a special way.

Jesus certainly wished His followers to repeat this rite, not as a single commemoration, but in order to continue His presence among them and to renew His sacrifice. Doubts have been cast upon the authenticity of this command to repeat the rite, but the practice could not have been begun against our Lord's wishes or without His invitation. It is evident that the early communities did repeat the rite. The frequent references to "the breaking of bread" are references to the Eucharist. The rite was the same at Corinth as at Jerusalem, and the meal itself similar to the meals shared by the disciples and their Master during his lifetime (similar, too, it seems, to those of the Qumran community). The mighty difference was the repetition of the words which turned the bread and wine into His Body and Blood. A new rite had been grafted on to the fraternal meal making it the Christian Pasch, instituted sacramentally before being realized on the Cross.—P. D.

258. V. ORDONEZ, "El Sacerdocio de los fieles. (Sentido escriturístico textual)," *RET* 64 ('56) 359-379.

"Priesthood" and "simple faithful" seem to suggest unequal concepts. Nevertheless, 1 Pt 2:4-9 and Ap 1:6, 20:6 speak about the priesthood of the faithful. The earliest ecclesiastical writers maintain the priestly character of all Christians. What do the quoted texts mean by this denomination? When the NT applies "priest" to the faithful, it always does so by using the Greek word

hiereus in contrast with the specially consecrated priests of the New Law who are always called *presbyteroi*. If we penetrate the *sensus scripturisticus* of the word *hiereus*, we will grasp the innermost meaning of the denomination "priesthood of the faithful." *Hiereus* occurs often in the NT and is used only to express the Jewish priesthood of the Old Law. 1 Pt 2:4-9 echoes Exodus. It is clear, then, that there is a parallelism between the priesthood of all Christians and that of the chosen people. The OT pictures the people playing an essential role in the sacrifice: offering of the victim, spreading of hands over the offerings, killing of the victim. Sir 34 and 35 tell us about the interior spirit which must be the root of any sacrifice, and the prophets vividly amplify this idea. All these characteristics blossom fully in us through Christ, making us a priestly race: "Having therefore . . . a confidence in the entering into the Holies by the blood of Christ . . ." (Heb 10:19); ". . . a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pt 2:5-4). The faithful, therefore, united with Christ play a priestly role, though different from that of the *presbyteroi*. The *sensus textualis* of the word *hiereus* is the key which opens the true meaning of the priesthood of the faithful.—L. M.

ARCHAEOLOGY

259. P. CORISH, "The Vatican Excavations," *IrTQ* 23 ('56) 273-277.

There was a real need for a book in English which would treat the problem of the Vatican excavations as a whole, in reasonably popular fashion and at a reasonable price. Such a book is *The Shrine of Peter* by J. Toynbee and J. Ward Perkins (London: Longmans, 1955). The second part, dealing with the *memoria apostolica*, is close but rewarding reading. No reasonable disagreement exists on the history of the site back to *ca.* 160 A.D. when the *tropaion* mentioned by Gaius was erected. What lay beneath this? Was it Peter's tomb? On this T and P adopt a rather over-cautious attitude: "although there is nothing to prove that this grave was that of St. Peter, nothing in the archeological evidence is inconsistent with such a conclusion." In alleging the improbability of the grave's site being remembered for over a hundred years, T and P assume the grave was unmarked; the evidence suggests it was. Doubt as to whether Peter's body could have been recovered during Nero's persecution is also unfounded.—G. G.

260. E. R. SMOTHERS, "The Excavations under St. Peter's," *TS* 17 ('56) 293-321.

The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations by Jocelyn Toynbee and John Ward Perkins is the fullest and best account we have in any language on the excavations under St. Peter's since the monumental report published in 1951 by the archaeologists immediately concerned in the excavations.

The Introduction gives the history of the excavations, the architectural situation in which they lie, a first glimpse of the site itself, the stream of previous publications, the plan of the present work.

The first part of the book deals with the Vatican Cemetery, covering first its general layout and chronology, with detailed description of representative tombs; second, a survey of the architecture and art of all the tombs; finally, an account of the owners and occupants, their social status and their religious beliefs. Much of the material of this first part is a positive contribution of great value on its own account, and of luminous relevance to an understanding of the Roman world into which St. Peter came and of the setting of his shrine.

The second part opens with a chapter on the tradition of St. Peter's presence and martyrdom in Rome, introductory to the archeological discussion of the pre-Constantinian shrine. This is followed by an account of the Constantinian basilica, with an epilogue on the influence of St. Peter's on the art and architecture of Europe.

The discovery of the niched monument of the Red Wall, a pre-Constantinian shrine of St. Peter, has been the outstanding achievement of the excavations. They have produced nothing to weaken the tradition of the Roman Christian community about its founder, and they have added positive elements of inestimable value to re-enforce it.—H. R. P.

261. J. MICHL, "Die Geburtsgrotte zu Bethlehem," *MTZ* 7 ('56) 115-119.

The information we have concerning the Nativity cave at Bethlehem and the views held up to now in its regard reveal that for the first hundred and fifty years of the Christian era we have no definite tradition about the cave; that our literary tradition dates from the year 150; and that archaeological investigations show construction there from the time of Constantine. Our later tradition points to the place now venerated, but that unfortunately does not rule out the possibility of an arbitrary choice of a cave in the first century and a half. Jerome and Paulinus make brief reference to the pagan rites at the cave-stable.—D. J. C.

262. C. ROBERTS, "The Book as the Creation of Christianity," *Listener** 56 ('56) 92-94.

Greek papyri excavated in thousands in Upper Egypt shed light on the book-form in use in the first centuries of the Christian era. Among non-Christian writings, the codex, as opposed to the roll-form, increases slowly from 2% to 74% of the total from the second to early fourth century. In the same period, virtually all Christian MSS of the Greek Bible are in the codex form; in fact no single text of the NT was ever written on the recto or normal writing surface of a roll. What then is the origin of the codex format? Though it appears first in Egypt and in papyrus form, the codex is undoubtedly Roman in ancestry, a lineal descendant of the parchment tablets or notebooks used from the first century B.C. by Roman writers for rough drafts. Presumably the earliest codices appeared in Rome as privately-circulated Christian writings and on parchment. Mark's Gospel, written in Rome, was probably the first. Thence it was carried to Egypt through ordinary trade channels, copied and circulated

on papyrus as a kind of missionary textbook. Not only the contents of the original, but its very format, were thus accurately preserved. The codex became henceforward the distinctive feature of Christian writings. The arrival of Mark's Gospel in Egypt is also a possible explanation of the early choice of St. Mark as patron of the Alexandrine Church.—G. G.

263. S. A. BIRNBAUM, "The Negeb Script," *VetT** 6 ('56) 337-371.

The manuscripts from Wadi Murabba'at are less extensive than the Qumran finds, but they have brought an equal surprise, because they show that there was close contact between Jews and Nabataeans, presumably in the northeastern corner of the Negeb. Close study of the Murabba'at finds, with photographs, drawings, charts, and examination of each letter in the alphabet, shows that from some time in the second half of the first century B.C. to the Bar-Cochba War (132-135) there existed a Jewish script which contained Hebrew and Nabataean elements. Paleographically, the documents in this alphabet of the Murabba'at finds appear to indicate that the script came into being in the second half of the first century B.C., through the influence of the Nabataean on Hebrew script. The period of amalgamation seems to have been of short duration. We may reasonably assume that the upheaval caused by the Bar-Cochba War resulted in the dispersal of those who used this writing and, therefore, that the Negeb script would have had no possibility of remaining alive.—W. M. A.

264. B. I. KNOTT, "The Christian 'Special Language' in the Inscriptions," *ViCh* 10 ('56) 65-79.

Examination of the speech of ordinary Christians of the first four centuries, as it is revealed in E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, helps us to appraise the theory that a distinctive Latin vocabulary and syntax developed within the early Christian community. The evidence for such a differentiation is not overwhelming as regards syntax but is promising in the area of new words. Biblical influence is to be found not so much in direct quotation as in association of ideas, e.g. *dextram optineam effugiamque levam* and *dextris tibi nunc fide adsistit in agnis* compared with Mt 25:22 ff.; and *nil me, mors impia, terres*, and *non multum, mors dira, nocet* compared with 1 Cor 15; as well as *simplex mundo sed sapiens domino* compared with Rom 16:19. While it becomes clear that at least in a later period there was no sharp distinction between Christian and pagan, and that Christian influence varies with the writer, there are distinctively Christian elements which cannot be explained away.—J. F. Br.

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

265. M. BAILLET, "Deux cantiques d'action de grâces du désert de Juda," *BLitE* 3 ('56) 129-141.

The translation of Canticle VIII and X is preceded by a history of the manuscript called by the first editor *Hodayot*. The study of the Dead Sea manuscripts

is just beginning, and work on them at present should be accepted in this light. The strange mingling of lament with thanksgiving in the canticles should be noted.—A. J. J.

266. R. DE VAUX, O.P., "A New Book on the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Blackfriars* 37 ('56) 461-466.

J. M. Allegro's book, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, in its treatment of the history of Qumran discoveries is praiseworthy, but some of the very important conclusions seem hazardous or simply erroneous. A is wrong in claiming that the Teacher of Righteousness is Zadok. He strains to find parallels between the Scrolls and the NT. He points out some differences between the two; D thinks others should be added: love of enemies vs. hatred; exclusiveness vs. universality; the Qumran group is based on the Teacher's instructions, while the Christian Church is based on the actual Resurrection of Christ. The following general criticism is applicable to A's book and to other recent studies where in Qumran discoveries and the NT are compared: "People seem to forget that both the Qumran Sect and the Primitive Church have close links with the Old Testament and with Judaism; many of the resemblances can be explained in terms of common antecedent."—H. M.

267. A. DUPONT-SOMMER, "On a Passage of Josephus Relating to the Essenes (*Antiq.* xviii, #22)," *JSS** 1 ('56) 361-366.

In the *Antiquities of the Jews*, xviii, i, 5, #18-22, Josephus gives a short but substantial account of the Essenes. D-S proposes the following translation for the obscure #22: "They (the Essenes) do not live in any different fashion, but conforming as much as possible to those of the Sadducees who are called the Many." The "Sadducees" and "the Many" are the *Bene Zadok* and *Harabbim* of Qumran. The *Bene Zadok* Sadducees are, of course, to be sharply distinguished from the classical Sadducees described by Josephus in an earlier paragraph. If this conjectured translation is correct, not only is another connexion between the Essenes and the Qumran Covenanters established but the Qumran community appears as the type or model according to which the Essene groups patterned their lives.—F. L. M.

268. G. GRAYSTONE, "Mr. Allegro's Pelican—the Scrolls for the Masses," *Tablet* 208 ('56) 355-356.

J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. (London: Penguin Books, 1956) handles admirably the factual side of the Scrolls but exaggerates their influence on Jesus and the first Jewish-Christians. The texts afford no basis for his claim that the Saviour of the world will emerge from the suffering of the Qumran sect to expiate the world's iniquity. It is a vast oversimplification to state that the leading ideas of Jesus' preaching are the same as those of Qumran. Jesus was no Qumran "prophet of doom," merely giving warning of the terrible visitation which would herald the proximate advent of God's kingdom, nor is

His ministry colored by a "cosmic battle" of the two Qumran Spirits, a battle first fought out in His own soul. The Lord's Supper and the Qumran messianic banquet are not basically the same rite, for nothing at Qumran corresponds to the intimate connection of the Christian rite with the person and saving work of Jesus. A finally postulates a wide hiatus between primitive Christianity and our present NT, thereby neglecting the evidence for reliable transmission of text and opening the door again to the out-moded contrast between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith.—G. G.

269. A. M. HABERMAN, "The Dead Sea Scrolls—A Survey and a New Interpretation," *Judaism** 5 ('56) 306-315.

The arguments of S. Zeitlin against the antiquity of the Scrolls have been well answered by scholars. The sect of Qumran was more probably Sadducean than Essene. Alexander Jannai, probably the "wicked priest," was a Sadducee. Segal believes that the Scrolls date to his time. The name of the sect derived from that of the Teacher of Righteousness or Zadok. The Essenes were non-political and do not seem to have been heretical, but the Scrolls abound in heresies. Identification of the Qumran sect with the Pharisees is out of the question. True, little is known of the Sadducees, but what do we know of the Essenes? The Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection of the dead, and there is no mention of a universal resurrection in any of the Scrolls. During the reign of Alexander Jannai, the Sadducees split. The schismatics were forced to flee to the Judean wilderness. This group forms the core from which Essenism later developed. The latest Scroll to be published is a commentary on chapters twelve to fourteen inclusive of Genesis. Abraham speaks in the first person, and Sarah's beauty is wonderfully described. The chief import of the Scrolls: an ancient and reliable witness of the Masoretic text; clear evidence for the Hebrew of the Second Temple; explanation of several ancient religious practices.—R. V. D.

270. A. JONES, "Qumran and Christianity," *Scripture* 8 ('56) 82-95.

It is rash to draw premature and inadequately substantiated conclusions from the Qumran literature; but it is foolish to ignore its great value as a witness to the living tradition, which continued unbroken despite the literary and canonical rupture between the two biblical economies. Light is thrown on the religious mind of the period, and, contrary to some assertions, Christianity emerges even more clearly as a divine revelation in history and not merely as a natural evolution. Christianity and Qumran are both reactions from the abuses of official Judaism, but while one is a flight from falsehood, the other is a confrontation with the truth; the message of one is expectation, of the other fulfillment. In Qumran Temple, priesthood and sacrifice are reduced (at least temporarily) to metaphor, but in Christianity they are raised to completion in the person of Christ. Light and darkness for Qumran are foes destined for a future combat; for Christianity the combat is already decided, the light has

shone in the darkness and the darkness did not master it. The apparently incompatible OT offices of High Priest and King give rise in Qumran to the expectation of two Messiahs, but in Christianity the dilemma is solved by their identification in one person (a synthesis demonstrated in Hebrews for an audience very similar to Qumran). The baptisms of Qumran were a series of purifications and a privilege of the tried elite, in contrast to the urgent and initiatory character of John's single baptism. Both Qumran and Christianity have a sacred banquet, a rehearsal of the great messianic banquet of the latter days; but this vital difference remains, that in the mind of Christ and His disciples the messianic banquet is already consummated. Qumran also throws light on such questions as the *florilegia*, or collections of OT texts used by the NT authors, and on the Semitic character of the Johannine literature.—K. K.

271. W. LA SOR, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," *VetT** 6 ('56) 425-429.

Gesenius in his *Hebrew Grammar* says that the Hebrew language tends to avoid a series of several coordinate genitives depending upon one and the same *nomen regens*. Joüon in his treatment of the same subject says that it is not necessary to repeat the *nomen regens* before each genitive. In the Manual of Discipline the expression *m^esiḥe 'aharon we'yisra'el* is an example of this problem of interpretation. Gesenius points out that it is usual for one *nomen regens* to govern successive genitives when the group may be logically treated as a unit. The following phrase is an example: "the life of your sons and daughters and the life of your wives and concubines." Sons and daughters is a unit, but wives and concubines is not; hence, the repetition of the *nomen regens*. It would seem from innumerable instances in which this rule is verified that if the expression "messiahs of Aaron and Israel" indicated two messiahs, it would read in the Hebrew "the messiah of Aaron and the messiah of Israel." Aaron and Israel could represent priest and laity or simply the entire community. The expression is then a universalism, and Brownlee's translation "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" is preferable if these conclusions are correct.—R. V. D.

272. R. NORTH, "'Serek a' and Related Fragments," *Orientalia* 25 ('56) 90-99.

The publication of *Qumran Cave I* by Barthélemy and Milik brings to light an important *Serek* fragment. The title *Serek ha 'Ēdâ* (Rule of the Congregation) differs from that of the longer document, *Serek ha-Yahad* (Rule of the Community). Perhaps, as Barthélemy suggests, both words were intended for the whole document, the former to be a more all-inclusive term for the sect. *Serek-a* sheds little new light on the questionable relationship of the Qumranites, most probably Essenes, to the Sadducees, though another Qumran fragment resembling the Cairo Genizah *Testament of Levi* might suggest some connection through the Karaites. The "Messiah of Israel" is given only second place in the order of blessings in *Serek-a*. Milik would explain that he is a secular authority inferior to the "Messiah of Aaron" or the high priest. N also comments on a

number of other expressions in the fragment. *Serek-b* is a collection of thirty-two small fragments, called "Blessings." The remaining fragments in *Qumran Cave I* are non-biblical materials, including two supplements to the War Scroll, many biblical-text fragments, and some biblical commentaries, among them a fragment of the *Dibrê Môšeh*.—G. W. M.

273. J. M. OESTERREICHER, "The Community of Qumran," *The Bridge* 2 ('56) 91-134.

The finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls has afforded unexpected confirmation of the unity between the old Israel and the Church. Investigation of the caves of Qumran in 1949 showed that they are connected with nearby ruins, long thought to be remains of a Roman military outpost. These ruins were once a monastery for the Qumran community. Further findings place the date of the Scrolls from 175 to 50 B.C. The Scrolls reveal that Jewish life was much richer and more complex than most realized, and they show that the Church was not an abrupt departure but a fulfillment of Israel. The group mentioned in the Scrolls, led by the Teacher of Justice, may well have been the faction that separated from Jerusalem after 167 B.C. as a protest against the Hasmonean usurpation of the priesthood. The identity and origin of their leader will probably never be known. His followers considered him a master and interpreter of the Law. His death is entirely obscure. He left as a legacy, however, a marvelously knit organization, the community of Qumran. The community, ruled by an "Overseer," was comprised of three groups: the priests, the elders, and "the many." Their important duties were prayer at determined times, keeping vigil, the study of the Torah, and manual work. Evidence indicates that some members of the community were allowed to marry. Chastity was held in high honor. Punishments (including permanent excommunication) were meted out for violation of the rules. The awe of God permeated the life of Qumran. Their piety was legal, but not legalistic. They spoke of themselves as the "New Covenant" and considered that there was no salvation outside of their community. They considered themselves the sons of light fighting the forces of Belial, the sons of darkness. The community was never numerous and remained exclusive, a fact which must have been a barrier between it and the Church. Furthermore it could not have accepted Christ's "love your enemies." Many phrases in the Scrolls echo the teaching of the NT, yet very much of the NT is not found in the writings of Qumran. The many similarities between the NT (St. John and St. Paul especially) and the Scrolls of Qumran do not add up to identity. More often NT and Qumran show a dependence on the OT or on apocryphal literature. It is not surprising certainly that Christ used the idiom of his time. The Teacher of Justice and Christ are incommensurable. The Teacher of Justice was the interpreter of the Law, while Christ wished to implant the Law in the hearts of His people. Nowhere did the community of Qumran claim the Teacher of Justice was the "Messiah of God" (Dupont-Sommer's theory). Nor did Christ have the same kind of dispute with the priests of the Temple

that the Teacher of Justice had. Christ's missionary doctrine too affords another contrast between Him and the Teacher of Justice. But though Qumran is not the cradle of the Church, the monks of Qumran are the Christian's kin.—J. F. B.

274. H. H. ROWLEY, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins," *Listener** 56 ('56) 711-713.

It is absurd to suggest that NT scholars have boycotted the Scrolls. Do the latter really herald a revolution in NT study? By no means! Scholars have known of the Qumran sect for nearly fifty years, since the Zadokite Work was published in 1910, just as they have known about the Essenes. Nor are Jewish messianic expectations anything new. There is no proof that the NT was indebted to Qumran messianic ideas. Was the Teacher of Righteousness, founder of the sect, crucified? One fragmentary text seems to allude to mass crucifixions, but if the Teacher were among the victims, he would be specifically mentioned. The NT does not leave us to infer that Jesus was crucified from a general statement that Pilate crucified men. There is no certain evidence that the Teacher was expected to rise again, nor any record—like the Christian record—that he actually did so. Did Christians derive baptism and the Eucharist from the sect's lustrations and common meals? Far from it! Qumran's practice of daily washing before meals contrasts strikingly with Jesus' defense of his disciples for eating with unwashed hands. Common meals were not the sole prerogative of the Dead Sea sect, and nothing shows that they connected them with the death of the Teacher or attached any saving significance to that death. The militarism of the War Scroll contrasts strongly with Jesus' absence of military pretensions. The Scrolls do make a positive contribution to NT study, inasmuch as they "give us clearer knowledge of the background against which Jesus is to be set, rather than out of which he emerged." Nothing in them touches the authority of the Bible or affects any Christian doctrine.—G. G.

275. H. H. ROWLEY, "The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PEQ* 88 ('56) 92-109.

References to Antiochus and Demetrius in the Nahum Peshier fragments indicate that the Teacher of Righteousness of the Qumran sect must have lived before the Roman period. The Kittim so often mentioned in the Scrolls would not then seem to be the Romans, as Allegro and Dupont-Sommer have maintained. The latter argued chiefly from the fact that the Kittim are said to have sacrificed to their standards. But there is no evidence that the Romans of Republican times practiced standard-worship as did the Imperial armies. Moreover, if we take the Kittim to refer to the Seleucids, there is evidence that standard-worship was common in the East in ancient times and specifically in Syria. But was the Teacher of Righteousness himself the contemporary of Alexander Jannaeus in the late second century B.C. or of Antiochus Epiphanes earlier in the same century? Allegro's view that Jannaeus persecuted the

Qumran sect and even crucified the Teacher of Righteousness is unsupported by the evidence of the MSS and offers some contradictory relationships among Jannaeus, the Kittim, and the sect. In the time of Antiochus, however, the Jewish priests were friendly with the Seleucids, and Antiochus did crucify some Jews. Demetrius I sent troops to Jerusalem in 161, shortly after the death of Antiochus. The Teacher of Righteousness, therefore, belonged to the earlier period, though he was not necessarily alive during the reign of Antiochus himself.—G. W. M.

276. A. RUBINSTEIN, "The Theological Aspect of Some Variant Readings in the Isaiah Scroll," *JSS** 6 ('55) 187-200.

Assuming that a textual variant has a purpose and is not clearly shown to be an error, one can ascribe a twofold purpose to variant readings: (1) an instance which aims at preventing an erroneous or irreverent interpretation by adhering too closely to the literal text and (2) the positive purpose of expressing particular religious views or sentiments. This paper considers eighteen variant readings of the Scroll from the MT text. Seven of these fall into the first category named above; eleven into the second. In general the Scroll uses the *waw* and prepositional prefixes more liberally than MT. This helps to make the meaning much more definite. One curious variant in 26:4 can hardly be due to a purely mechanical scribal error. This is the *wt'sr* of the Scroll for the MT *wt'bd*. A reasonable explanation is to take the root *'sr* in its post-exilic meaning "and thou didst forbid." The use of this verb makes it unlikely that the Scroll reading is original. In several entries R assesses the contributions to the textual criticism of this Scroll made by Barthélemy, Burrows, and Brownlee. The view of Brownlee, who states that the variants under discussion are the product of the sectaries of Qumran, seems more likely than the opinion of Barthélemy, who suggests that the Scroll variants represent original readings.—R. V. D.

277. H. STEGEMANN, "Die Risse in der Kriegsrolle von Qumran (= Der gegenwärtige Stand, 33)," *TL* 81 ('56) 205-210.

Sukenik's *Osar* Table 30 gives the space between two damaged spots of Column 15 as 97.5mm, 14 too much; hence most efforts at restoration are too long. In Column 18 Sukenik's space is just 14mm too short (Table 33); and further measurements justify Stegemann's renditions of Column 19 (questioned by J. Hempel in *ZAW* 68 ['56] 211).—R. N.

278. L. E. TOOMBS, "The Early History of the Qumran Sect," *JSS** 1 ('56) 367-381.

T argues that the sequence of passages in the Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) unfolds the sect's history, part of which the author desired to set forth in loosely chronological order. 7:5-8:3 of DSH marks the dividing line between earlier and more recent history. Consequently the term Teacher of Righteousness, which appears in both parts, does not refer to a single individual, but is a

general term to designate the leader of the sect at any period of its history. The Teacher of Righteousness in the first part of DSH is the Lawgiver of the Zadokite Fragments (ZF); in the second part of DSH he is the Teacher of the Community, a later and different figure, contemporary with the author of DSH.

Using the composite data of DSH and ZF a rough chronology of events in the history of the sect is possible. The sectarian movement began with a rather vague feeling of spiritual unrest, probably just after the Battle of Panias in 198 B.C. Among important events succeeding this beginning are the following, all approximate: after 170 B.C. a short period of consolidation of doctrine and law in Damascus; return to Judah and growth of the sect in numbers and influence, due to the fervor of Maccabean times, 165-115 B.C.; occupation of Qumran site during critical days of hostile John Hyrcanus I, 110 B.C.; DSH written in 77 B.C., one year before the death of persecuting Alexander Janneus; death of the Teacher of the Community, 70 B.C.; ZF written 70-30 B.C.; the Teacher of Righteousness *par excellence* (the Messiah) expected about forty years after the death of the Teacher of the Community, i.e. 30 B.C.—F. L. M.

INTERTESTAMENTAL STUDIES, RABBINICAL LITERATURE, APOCRYPHA

279. M. BRAUN, "The Prophet Who Became a Historian," *Listener** '56 ('56) 53-57.

We today are in a better position to understand Josephus, for we have passed through a similar historical predicament, viz. a tidal wave of pseudo-messianic madness leading to war and destruction, with its outcrop of traitors and renegades. Josephus prophesied that Vespasian would succeed to the Empire, and the key to understanding Josephus lies in this prophecy. Reasons of self-apologetic and defense of his people clearly motivated Josephus in writing his Jewish Wars, but it was chiefly his consciousness of being a God-inspired prophet, dating from the brief moment he stood before Vespasian on the stage of world history, that colored his thinking and writing. The destruction of the Temple of Herod on the same day as its predecessor six hundred years earlier set the seal on Josephus' attitude; in fact the fate of the Temple became the central theme of his work. The tragic fatality and implicit trust in oracles that characterized certain Greek writings were transferred by Josephus to the higher plane of Jewish monotheism. The Jews went to war on the strength of Daniel's prophecy of the Messianic kingdom; they misunderstood it (it really referred to Vespasian), and fate, divine chastisement, took its course. Using Roman power for his own purposes, God, not Rome, triumphed in 70 A.D.

On the political side, Josephus entered a plea of "not guilty" for his people. They were led astray by a handful of fanatics, not unlike the German Nazis. In fine, both theological and historical lines of reasoning led to the same conclusion—the folly of rebellion against Rome.

By blending Jewish religious approach with Greek art forms and thought

patterns, J thus paved the way for the Christian interpretation of history.—G. G.

280. J. EDGAR BRUNS, "Joseph Klausner: THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN ISRAEL," *The Bridge* 2 ('56) 315-321.

K's newest book shows great learning, wide familiarity with the subject matter, and reverence for the topic. The study is not, however, completely objective, and it contains at times contradictions. Though K may not agree with the Christian interpretation of the prophecies, one has a right to expect that he acknowledge that interpretation, rather than ignore it as unworthy of attention. Furthermore, his understanding of Christian theology is always that of Liberal Protestantism. The characteristics of Catholic Christianity are given no consideration. He seems unaware that many Catholic exegetes hold views diametrically opposed to those he condemns. Christianity, for him, is seen in the deliberately individualistic vein of the Protestant Reformation, especially in the notion of the kingdom of heaven and in the question of social responsibilities. Discussing the Servant of Yahweh prophecy in Is 53, he acknowledges that it was partially realized in the person of Jesus, but adds: "The rest of his career is intentionally portrayed in the Gospels in such a manner that the events appear to have happened in fulfillment of the words in this chapter." He offers no proof for this assertion. The Messiah of the Servant Songs, he insists, is not just an individual but more the nation, the whole people of Israel becoming the redeemer of mankind. This interpretation is not new, but the ever-increasing knowledge of Semitic thought and language is constantly reducing its acceptability. K firmly asserts that Judaism never took the step of postulating a divine Messiah. Though there may be certain indications in the later Midrashim, these are to be regarded as unconscious borrowings from Christianity. K ignores other plausible explanations. The obvious obstacle to the question of divinity is his fervent devotion to God's unity; for K, anything remotely suggestive of a trinity of persons in the divine nature is anathema, illogical. Yet he admits that in the question of Israel's great prophet "certain variations and inconsistencies are inevitable." Finally B finds fault with K's contention, that Jewish 'prophetic idealism' is far removed from the 'otherworldliness' of Christ's kingdom.—H. M.

281. D. DAUBE, "The Gospels and the Rabbis," *Listener** 56 ('56) 342-346.

The NT is best viewed against the background of contemporary Palestinian Judaism. Thus "overshadow" in Lk 1:35 refers to Ru 3:9, "spread thy wing over thy handmaid," interpreted by the rabbis as revealing exceptional chastity. Hence, Mary, though with child, is yet a virgin. In the miraculous feeding of the multitude, the Christian Messianic community is also compared to Ruth. To the rabbis, Boaz stood for God, and Ruth for her descendants, David and even the Messiah, and the meal was regarded as miraculous—"she did eat and was filled and left thereof" (Ru 2:14, cf. Mt 14:20).

The rules of certain Jewish Passover-eve groups shed light on the Gethsemane

narrative: if one member fell asleep—not simply dozed—the bond was dissolved. Hence Jesus' request to his disciples to stay awake, and his resolve to go on alone when he returned for the last time and found them sleeping (Mt 26:38,45). Similarly, the rabbinic idea of "disgrace"—for a corpse to be buried in a common grave or mutilated or unanointed—gives point to the Evangelists' insistence that the body of Jesus, duly anointed and without a bone broken (Jn 19:36), was interred in the family grave of Joseph of Arimathea.

The sequence of questions in Mt 22:15-46 (the tribute, resurrection, greatest commandment, Son of David) corresponds to four categories of rabbinic questions—questions of wisdom, mockery, conduct, and exegesis. In the Passover-eve liturgy, the first three are posed by the son, the last by the head of the family.

Whence comes the varied NT usage of imposing hands, whether to bless or heal, as with Jesus, or to ordain presbyter-bishops, as in Ti? An obvious explanation is rabbinic practice, which distinguished a gentle placing of hands to mediate some beneficial influence, and a heavy "leaning" when a rabbi "ordained" his disciples. "Male and female he created them" (Mt 19:4) alludes to the rabbinic theory that the original Adam was male and female in one; hence a powerful argument against divorce, whether or not Jesus accepted the theory.—G. G.

282. C. ROTH, "An Ordinance Against Images in Jerusalem, A.D. 66," *HTR** 49 ('56) 169-177.

Renewed interest in the problem of the Judaic attitude toward art and images at the beginning of the Christian era invites re-examination of the evidence supporting this accepted view: that at least up to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., there was a completely effective rabbinic ban on any sort of iconographic representation for whatever purpose. There is certain evidence that human images in the flat or the round were not tolerated by the Jews before the destruction of Jerusalem, but it seems probable that this opposition was aroused more by political feeling than by religious conviction, especially when it concerned Roman military standards or medallions of Caesar. There seems to be no evidence for a rabbinic ban, complete and effective, on non-human effigies, at least for decorative purposes. Philo is curiously reticent on the subject, though he manifests a keen sense of artistic appreciation. The attitude of Josephus toward iconography seems to have become stricter as his career progressed. In 4 B.C. extreme wing Pharisees, belonging to the first generation tannaim, taught that no representation of any living creature could lawfully be placed in the Temple. This extremist teaching led youthful zealots to strike down the Roman eagle in the Temple. They, together with the two rabbis inciting the action, were put to death. They were considered heroes and their doctrine became a basic principle in patriotic circles. In 66 A.D., during the revolt against Rome and the fleeting establishment of independence, the Sanhedrin met in the Temple Court and pronounced the ban which represents the climax of the anti-iconic tendency in Judaism.—W. J. B.

BOOKS AND OPINIONS

Following suggestions from many readers and in accord with our own observations, we have begun some experimental methods of handling book reviews. Thus this special section, BOOKS AND OPINIONS.

Obviously if we were to be true to our original intention of giving a running chronicle of NT scholarship as it appears in the journals, we had to include reviews—most journals divide (sometimes in equal parts) between articles and reviews. But just as obviously we had to abandon our aim of complete coverage for reasons of manageability. Book reviews are of unequal interest, and the time-lag between the publication of a review of the same book in different journals made it evident that we would have to depart from the policy maintained in the abstract-section of presenting the contents of the journals as they came out. It seemed advisable, too, since the very nature of “reviews” invited it, that we abandon in some degree the strictly impersonal character of mere *précis*. When a profile of reviewers’ opinions can be better given by the intrusion of NTA’s *obiter dicta*, we have not hesitated to speak out.

The following are the mechanics of BOOKS AND OPINIONS: a group of twenty-five leading journals in the major languages (these journals have been marked by the letter B in the list of journals on the back cover) has been selected. We use these journals as bellwethers in determining which of the current books are considered important by scholars. All the reviews in these journals are noted; and, when a book has received sufficient notice (our judgment of this is based on the number of times it has been reviewed, primarily, but other factors, i.e., length of reviews, standing of the reviewers, etc., are also considered), we begin to look for it in all the journals covered by NTA. It is not, of course, possible for us to determine when the last word on a given book has been spoken; so, when an interesting body of opinion has been gathered, we will print it, and add to it in subsequent issues as new opinions are published.

The format, while flexible, will generally consist in a bibliographic notice of the book under discussion, a short word on its contents or thesis, followed by a gathering of the reviewers’ opinions. We hope in this way to create a brisk exchange among the reviewers. We think, when they are all heard together like this, the effect is forensic and sometimes exciting.

This issue of BOOKS AND OPINIONS has been compiled by the following: J. B. Coll, J. L. Connor, J. P. Duffy, W. J. Feeney, W. F. Macomber, F. X. Shea, R. L. Twomey, R. E. Varnerin.

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

BOOKS (283r-292r):

GEOFFREY GRAYSTONE, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1955. \$2.50.

MILLAR BURROWS, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: The Viking Press, 1955. \$6.50.

JOHN ALLEGRO, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Penguin Books. 3/6.

Mr. Edmund Wilson started something. Popularizations on the DSS continue to come. We did not feel that the scope of this book survey, the interest of our readers, or (let it be said) the quality of the more recent publications have warranted that we treat all of the books under separate headings. So here, under three of the better known titles, roughly representing the right, left, and center, we present a medley of opinion on a medley of DSS books.

OPINION:

283r. ROLAND DE VAUX (in *RB* 63 [’56] 471) agrees with the general opinion on Burrows: “The most important of the works . . .” (on the DSS); “the thoughtful author . . . has given a lively treatment and an exposition of remarkable clarity to difficult questions.” While he warns specialists that this is a popular book which eschews lengthy cavil and cumbersome apparatus, he tells them to expect “weighty judgements (sometimes a bit diffident) . . .,” delivered by “. . . one of their peers who knows whereof he speaks.” In the same issue (472) Father de Vaux, unmoved by the kindly treatment accorded him personally by Mr. Wilson, tartly reviews *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*. While he recognizes the author as “a scrivener of talent” and calls his book “a masterpiece of reporting, occasionally charming and serious,” he is displeased at the irresponsibility he detects in a book “very much thinner in every sense of the word . . .” than Burrows. Wilson “despite his vast culture, his talents . . . is outside the subject he treats”; and de Vaux witheringly concludes that his whilom guest in Jerusalem was badly prepared for his task of “comprehending texts which, being religious texts, should be approached with [at least] a minimum of religious sense.” De Vaux also (473) takes brief but favourable notice of R. B. Y. Scott’s *Treasure from the Judean Caves* (Toronto: The United Church Publishing House, 1955. vii, 43).

284r. The *London Times* reviewer (in *TLS* 2844 [Nov. 9, 1956] 669) treats Allegro and Graystone together, along with Hugh J. Schonfield’s *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Valentine, Mitchell, 1956) and gives them all a pat and a knock. Allegro is praised for his style and verve (which compares favorably with that of the professional Mr. Wilson) but is soundly thumped for a “. . . confidence which is most in evidence when it is least justified.” Father Graystone’s work is much shorter and less exciting “. . . while enjoying the not unimportant merit of being more reliable and balanced.” Schonfield has done valuable work in assembling useful rabbinic and pseudepigraphical sources, but otherwise has little to offer in style or content. The reviewer remarks that the Scrolls have not yet found a chronicler of scholarship and balance who can write attractively; for, though Burrows’ book “is by long odds the most reliable,” its author does not have “an easy style.”

285r. JOHN J. COLLINS (in *CBQ* 18 [’56] 188) lauds Burrows in a lengthy review for his sober treatment of the Scrolls and details his contributions. He

thinks the book complements Wilson's and should be recommended to anyone whose interest has been aroused sufficiently by Wilson's work to wish to pass to the "intermediate class" in DSS study. In a review immediately following in the same issue (191), ROGER MERCURIO expresses the rather embarrassed gratitude of scholars to Edmund Wilson for suddenly thrusting their eremitic labors in the center ring, but (of course) deplores his sensational theologizings.

286r. FREDERICK L. MORIARTY (in *America* 94 [Feb. 4, '56] 508) reviews Wilson and Burrows together. He finds Wilson "fascinating, readable and generally reliable" but seems wryly amused at his report that there "exists a perceptible tension among religiously committed scholars." Burrows is unreservedly praised.

287r. JOSEPH A. FITZMEYER (in *Commonweal* 62 [June '55] 327) is unenthusiastic about Graystone's book. He feels that, in reaction to Wilson, Graystone so tendentiously emphasizes the points of dissimilarity between Christianity and Qumran that he ignores genuine evidence of influence from the sect on the early Church.

288r. FREDERICK L. MORIARTY (in *CBQ* 18 ['56] 437) finds that Graystone's book offers a needed counterpoise to Wilson's journalistic invasion of scholarship. He feels that, when the final reckoning is made, scholarly opinion will be found approving Graystone's sceptical attitude.

289r. GEOFFREY GRAYSTONE (in the *Tablet* 208 [Oct. '55] 355) confronts Allegro and finds his "sketch of the mission and teaching of Jesus . . . a vast oversimplification." He insinuates that Allegro's assumptions are based on "the out-moded theories of German critics of the last century" and posits Burrows' book as *the* book "which contains the most thorough and competent treatment that has so far appeared. . . ." He compliments Allegro on his enthusiastic and detailed chronicle of the discovery and early history of the Scrolls themselves.

290r. RAYMOND E. BROWN (in *CBQ* 18 ['56] 435) thinks Roland Murphy's book (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*. Westminster: Newman, 1956, \$1.50) is the best treatment of the DSS done by a Catholic. It avoids the excessive and uncalled-for polemics of Graystone. It does not attain the distinction of Burrows' scholarship, but does not pretend to. Brown feels, however, that Murphy should be willing to accept the argument of those who find in John the Baptist a point of contact between Christianity and Qumran.

291r. L. JOHNSTON (in *Tablet* 208 [Nov. '56] 428) has this to say about Schonfield: "'I know who I was when I got up this morning, but I think I must have changed several times since then.' And, like Alice, one feels that the Dead Sea Scrolls would hardly know who they were by the time Mr. Schonfield has finished with them." He then goes on to substantiate this topic sentence.

292r. ROLAND MURPHY (in *CBQ* 18 ['56] 472) takes curt notice of the publication in a monograph of Solomon Zeitlin's *JQR* articles on the DSS: (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship*, Jewish Quarterly Review monograph series, No. III, Philadelphia, 1956).

For de Vaux on Allegro see NTA, present issue, number 266. Cf. also Graystone NTA 268.

TWO VOLUMES OF STUDIES

BOOK (293r-314r):

Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Ed. by D. E. Nineham. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955). Pp. xvi & 262. 30s.

Twelve essays, most of them discussions of problems in Gospel form-criticism, pay tribute to the late Robert Henry Lightfoot. N introduces the volume with a biographical sketch of Lightfoot.

293r. L. H. BROCKINGTON, "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of δόξα" (pp. 1-8).—The vocabulary of the Septuagint influenced the NT concept of "glory" especially in regard to the related notions of God's radiance, power, and miraculous activity, His salvific power, and the divine image.

294r. C. H. DODD, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ" (pp. 9-25).—D examines the accounts of the resurrection from the viewpoint of form-criticism and finds that they fall into two main types, the concise and the circumstantial narrative. The concise narrative is constructed according to a fixed pattern leading up to a saying of the Lord, e.g. Mt 28:8-10, 16-20; Jn 20:19-21. The circumstantial narrative does not follow a pattern and is concerned with details and circumstances, e.g. Lk 24:13-35; Jn 21:1-14. Form-criticism does not support the theory of some that the accounts of the miraculous catch of fish (Lk 5:1-11) and the transfiguration are displaced resurrection narratives, although this would be possible in the case of the walking on the waters (Jn 6:16-20). The oldest traditions of the resurrection are probably contained in brief summaries (e.g. Lk 24:34; 1 Cor 15:4-5) and lists (e.g. 1 Cor 5:5-7). There is nothing in the resurrection accounts characteristic of apocalyptic literature, nor may they justly be termed myths.

OPINION:

295r. S. E. JOHNSON (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 250) finds it "clear, cogent, and suggestive, . . . a very important contribution." F. J. SCHIERSE (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 613) thinks that "the article is extremely instructive and stimulating. However, the viewpoint of form-criticism is incapable of passing final judgment on the problem of resurrection narratives." C. BUTLER (in *DowR* 73 ['54-'55] 380-81) considers D's to be the most important essay of the collection.

296r. C. F. EVANS, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel" (pp. 37-53).—The pericopes of Lk 9:51-18:14 follow an arrangement very close to that

found in Dt cc. 1-26. Luke used this parallelism to show that Jesus is "the Prophet like unto Moses" foretold by Dt 18:18.

OPINION:

297r. S. E. JOHNSON (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 248) finds this of all the essays "the most suggestive and revolutionary . . . though some of the parallels seem far-fetched, the new approach deserves careful study." F. J. SCHIERSE (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 613) concludes his brief summary with an exclamation point. For C. F. D. MOULE (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 280-281), though E's idea "is a brilliantly ingenious one, and may indeed prove to be an important clue," it raises problems. Some of the allusions to Moses suggest Exodus rather than Deuteronomy. Furthermore, "why has not Luke assimilated his eschatological material . . . to the deuteronomic last words of Moses?"

298r. A. M. FARRER, "On Dispensing with Q" (pp. 55-58).—The hypothesis of the existence of Q rests on the supposition that Luke did not know Mt. F tries to show that the common material in Lk is derived from Mt, being modified by the Evangelist's desire to combine the doctrinal fulness of Mt with the narrative power of Mk. In order that the narrative should not be encumbered, Luke concentrated his doctrinal material in the central section, cc. 10-18, which he arranged on the pattern of Dt. Both Lk and Mt are hexateuchic in structure.

OPINION:

299r. S. E. JOHNSON (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 248) remarks that "many of his points have been anticipated," and he asks why the so-called "Q" material appears de-Matthaeized in Lk and why Lk's theology is simpler and less ecclesiastical than Mt's. He suggests that Luke may have used both Mt and Q. C. BUTLER (in *DowR* 73 ['54-'55] 382) agrees that Q can be dispensed with and is, therefore, inadmissible; but he finds F's type of argumentation distasteful. M. ZERWICK (in *VD* 34 ['56] 98) thinks that the theory of a common source, as defended by such moderns as Cerfaux, Vaganay, Dupont, and Parker, involves less exegetical virtuosity and suits better the textual data and individual character of the Evangelists.

300r. J. C. FENTON, "Paul and Mark" (pp. 89-112).—The Gospels have a meaning deeper than the obvious sense of the narratives would imply. The Epistles of Paul, being the product of the same spiritual atmosphere in which and for which the Gospels were composed, especially Mk, can be used as a key to that more profound sense. To compare the theology of Mark and Paul, F chooses some themes of Paul's theology and re-reads Mk in their light.

OPINION:

301r. F. J. SCHIERSE (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 613).—"The common themes are so general that little is gained." M. ZERWICK (in *VD* 34 ['56] 98) praises the

essay for emphasizing the basic unity of the NT, whose parts should be interpreted in the light of the entire revelation.

302r. C. P. M. JONES, "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan Writings" (pp. 113-143).—Heb resembles Lk and Acts in vocabulary, material, and theology. The affinity in doctrine is especially strong in eschatology which contrasts with that of the other families of NT hagiographers, i.e., Mk-Mt and Paul-John. This seems to indicate that Lk, Acts, and Heb form a group separate from the rest of the NT, so that one of the group may be legitimately interpreted by the others.

OPINION:

303r. F. J. SCHIERSE (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 613) admits that some of the similarities are well-founded, while others are dubious or artificial. One great dissimilarity has been overlooked: the Alexandrianism characteristic of Heb is totally absent from Lk and Acts. M. ZERWICK (in *VD* 34 ['56] 99) considers this essay a substantial contribution toward demonstrating an affinity that has been pointed out long ago.

304r. G. D. KILPATRICK, "The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mk 13:9-11" (pp. 145-158).—There would seem to be no mention in Mk of the gospel being preached to the Gentiles. Mk 13:10 should be re-punctuated and interpreted as a mission, not *to* the Gentiles, but *among* them, i.e., to the Jews of the Diaspora.

OPINION:

305r. C. BUTLER (in *DowR* 73 ['54-'55] 381) notes that this exegesis is based on a solution of the Synoptic Problem that he thinks unacceptable. C. F. D. MOULE (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 281) praises K's use of linguistical and statistical methods in scriptural exegesis. The proposed punctuation, however, creates two linguistic anomalies not explained by K.

G. W. H. LAMPE, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke" (pp. 159-200).—Lk together with Acts is rightly called the Gospel of the Holy Spirit. The activity of the Spirit before the birth of Christ, in His life and ministry, and, after and by the power of His death and resurrection, in His disciples, forms the central idea that gives unity to the works of Luke.

OPINION:

306r. S. E. JOHNSON (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 248) characterizes as "brilliant" Lampe's treatment, especially his summary of OT doctrine on the Spirit of God. C. BUTLER (in *DowR* 73 ['54-'55] 381) terms L's study "masterful." M. ZERWICK (in *VD* 34 ['56] 100) praises the solidity of L's treatment and the justice of his views.

307r. D. M. MACKINNON, "Sacrament and Common Meal" (pp. 201-207). The Last Supper should be viewed in its relationship to the Passover of the

GT, to the cross, and to the Messianic banquet of life eternal. This is the spirit in which the Holy Eucharist should be celebrated.

OPINION:

308r. F. J. SCHIERSE (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 614) considers this essay as "an edifying meditation on the Holy Eucharist in a remarkably Catholic form."—C. BUTLER (in *DowR* 73 ['54-'55] 381) finds the essay "obscure."

309r. T. W. MANSON, "Realized Eschatology and the Messianic Secret" (pp. 209-222).—According to Schweitzer Jesus looked for the immediate coming of the kingdom of God in glory. According to Dodd, however, Jesus was conscious that He, in His own person and in His ministry, was the promulgation of the New Law and the kingdom actually present. M thinks that this latter "*realized* eschatology," as opposed to Schweitzer's "*thorough-going* eschatology," corresponds better to the question that Wrede raised concerning the Messianic secret. The secret was not, as Wrede supposed, that Jesus was the Messiah, but rather that the humiliations and sufferings of His ministry and Passion *are* "the kingdom and the power and the glory." Furthermore, it was not a secret because Jesus Himself concealed it, but rather because His disciples completely misunderstood it. For them the Son of Man of whom Jesus spoke would have been understood collectively as Jesus with His chosen ones. Therefore, the predictions of the Passion would not have been understood as referring to Jesus Himself.

OPINION:

310r. F. J. SCHIERSE (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 613) thinks that M is rather one-sided in his treatment but that his views deserve consideration. C. BUTLER (in *DowR* 73 ['54-'55] 381) doubts that Jesus' contemporaries would have interpreted the Son of Man of Daniel in a collective sense. He also questions the change in Christ's use of the term that M professes to detect. M. ZERWICK (in *VD* 34 ['56] 100-101) also questions the collective interpretation of Daniel by Jesus' disciples. He admits that M makes valuable contributions but protests against the apparent limitation of "the kingdom and the power and the glory" to Jesus' ministry, suffering, and death.

311r. D. E. NINEHAM, "The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel: An Examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis" (pp. 223-239).—Dodd held that Mk composed his Gospel on the framework of a traditional chronology of Jesus' ministry. Into it he inserted a fairly large number of other pericopes, not always correctly. The fundamental order of the Gospel, however, would be historical. N questions the validity of Dodd's arguments.

OPINION:

312r. C. F. D. MOULE (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 281-282) finds that N's arguments are also open to criticism, especially his contention that the outline of Mk was

devoid of any religious or practical value. "In particular, it is a question of great importance for the ministry of Jesus whether 'Caesarea-Philippi' was or was not a watershed [i.e., a turning-point]." Nonetheless, N's is an "inquiry which deserves much further pondering in view of the importance of its subject."

313r. H. F. D. SPARKS, "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels" (pp. 241-262).—The frequency with which God is called Father in the Gospels increases from three times in Mk to one hundred and twenty times in Jn. This reflects an increasing awareness of the central importance of this doctrine. In most of these occurrences God is called the Father of Jesus, but in a significant number of cases God is called the Father of His disciples. In the one rather dubious instance of Mt 23:9, God seems to be called the Father of all men. S concludes, therefore, that in the teaching of Christ and His disciples men are not sons of God by nature: by grace they can become sons of God when they recognize the Messianic sonship of Jesus and are thus incorporated into the Messianic community.

OPINION:

314r. F. J. SCHIERSE (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 613) remarks on the "actuality" of S's views. C. BUTLER (in *DowR* 73 ['54-'55] 381-382) calls S's essay "a refreshing study." He accepts the main conclusion as proved. He is also pleased with S's study of Mk 11:25 which B considers confirms his own findings in *The Originality of St. Matthew*, pp. 134-136.

BOOK (315r-318r):

G. R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *Jesus and the Future. An Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13, with Special Reference to the Little Apocalypse Theory*, London: Macmillan, 1954.

The scope of the book is contained in its sub-title. The first third of the book is given up to an historical survey of the Little Apocalypse Theory. The middle section of the book contains a similar survey of other theories of Mark 13 advanced in the last hundred years by critical and conservative scholars respectively. A long final chapter is devoted to various individual points connected with the Discourse, and particularly its relation to other writings. Here the author's own conclusions finally emerge.

OPINION:

315r. D. E. NINEHAM (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 110) believes that, "To the future student of NT eschatology this book will be invaluable." One serious limitation noted by N, due to the nature of the undertaking rather than to any fault of B-M's execution, is that the views discussed are considered very largely in isolation from the general theological position of those who propounded them and also from the general position of Gospel study at the time when they were propounded. This accounts for a "slight air of unreality" about B-M's attempt at conclusions.

316r. M.-E. BOISMARD (in *BB* 62 ['55] 137) believes that B-M has made an exhaustive and very interesting study. He sees in the book a valuable summary of the various views on the eschatological discourse. B differs with B-M in preferring that Greek Matthew and Mark rely on a common source. He wonders, too, whether B-M is sufficiently aware of the influence which the poorly expressed notions of eschatology in primitive teaching could have exerted on Christ's sermons.

317r. ERIC MAY (in *TS* 16 ['55] 134) considers this book as a valuable reference source to the various positions on the eschatological problem. While agreeing with the author in many things especially in his acceptance of the Synoptic Apocalypse as authentic, M is rather disappointed in B-M's conclusions, especially his evaluation of Christ. M feels that B-M has erred in neglecting almost entirely the many fine Catholic works on the subject.

318r. F. J. SCHIERSE (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 309) thinks that the book will be greeted as a valuable aid by theologians engaged in the problem of the Synoptic Apocalypse. It cannot, however, claim the ultimate solution to the various exegetical problems involved in the sermon on the parousia. Especially interesting are his explanations of those texts which substantiate the expectation of a proximate parousia. B-M is also commended by S in seeing that the basic difficulties in this whole matter are rather dogmatic than exegetical.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

BOOK (319r-323r):

A. VÖÖBUS, *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies*. Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 6. (Stockholm, 1954). Pp. xvii & 412, 24 facsimiles. Obtainable from Dean Jacob Aunver, Odensgeten 15-I, Uppsala, Sweden (kr. 83.90) and from the bookstore, Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois (\$12).

V offers an encyclopaedic survey of the early translations of the NT based on twenty years of personal research. For each version he gives the sources of information, the backgrounds of its origin, its subsequent history, and the salient problems connected with it.

OPINION:

319r. B. M. METZGER (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 62-63) considers this book a masterpiece of its kind, notes V's constant recourse to manuscript sources, and praises his industrious scholarship. V's investigation of the interrelationships of the versions is a valuable contribution. He failed to mention, however, the Nubian, Sogdian, and Old Albanian versions.

320r. M. BLACK (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 118-119) praises V's erudition and considers this book a "must" for all interested in the history of the ancient versions. He notes that important works published after 1953 are not mentioned. He thinks

V's theory on the origin of the Peshitta deserving of special mention even though he does not entirely agree with it.

321r. M.-E. BOISMARD (in *RB* 63 ['56] 453-454) strongly recommends the book, not only for an over-all view of the positions of other experts, but also for V's own views which, being the result of long study and personal acquaintance with the ancient languages, have special interest. He accepts many of V's opinions, in particular, a Syriac origin for the *Diatessaron* and its influence on both the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions. Indirectly, through the Old Syriac, it would have influenced the Armenian and Ethiopic versions. B thinks, however, that both the Old Latin and the Ethiopic originally existed in two forms, one a translation from the Syriac, the other directly translated from the Greek.

322r. V. TAYLOR (in *ExpT* 67 ['55] 69-70) notes that V "has illuminated many old problems and raised new ones and it will be some time before the value of his results and suggestions can be assessed. . . . One cannot be too grateful for this illuminating and stimulating work."

323r. H. VOGELS (in *TRev* 51 ['55] 175-177) welcomes with joy a reliable work that fills a great lacuna in the field of textual criticism and sheds much light, besides, on the history of the Church and of the missions. He prefers to think that the *Diatessaron* was composed in Greek and was almost immediately translated into Syriac by Tatian himself. He notes that the commentaries are not mentioned as witnesses for the text of the Old Latin version of the Pauline Epistles.

BOOK (324r-330r):

J. H. GREENLEE, *The Gospel Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*. Studies and Documents, ed. by S. Lake and C. Hoeg, vol. 17. (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955). Pp. 100. Kr. 16.

The search for "local" texts used by the different churches of rank is an important development of modern textual criticism of the NT. The *Catechetical and Mystagogical Lectures* of Cyril of Jerusalem provide the best evidence for the text of the church of Jerusalem. G has gathered those variants from the *Textus Receptus* found in Cyril's Gospel citations that do not seem to be the result of inaccuracy, harmonization, or mere allusion and has collated them with the readings of the Caesarean family of MSS and versions and the writings of Origen and Eusebius. He has tabulated the evidence separately for each Gospel together with a statistical summary and the conclusions that seem warranted. It appears that Cyril used a Caesarean text throughout the four Gospels. This seems certain for Mk, less certain for the others, since the isolation of a Caesarean text-family is only certain for Mk. The Synoptics conform more or less closely to the Pre-Caesarean text, whereas the text of Jn is closer to that used by Origen and Eusebius. From the fact that an intense rivalry existed at this time between Caesarea and Jerusalem, G concludes that the

common text must go back to a time that antedates the rivalry. Therefore, the text might better be named Palestinian than Caesarean.

OPINION:

324r. R. V. G. TASKER (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 278-280) praises G's work as "a model for all younger scholars who may wish to undertake research of this nature." In particular, he notes G's awareness of the limitations of his evidence and the difficulty of defining the exact meaning of the term Caesarean text.

325r. E. F. SIEGMAN (in *CBQ* 18 ['56] 206-207) notes G's rigorous methodology "which inspires confidence in his conclusions. . . . Even the biblical student who is not particularly interested in textual work will be rewarded by studying this fine dissertation; his respect for text critics will be heightened by this opportunity to watch one of them at work." He remarks that "Caesarean" may seem to some an artificial unification of a "set of amorphous and disparate variants, were it not for the minute and painstaking scientific studies that cumulatively justify the acceptance of a Caesarean Family. Greenlee's is one of these studies."

326r. A. WIKGREN (in *JR* 36 ['56] 200) describes this as "a valuable contribution to the search for 'local' texts." The evidence, though weak in the case of Mk [sic], strongly supports G's conclusions. "What this may mean in terms of the so-called 'Caesarean' text as a local text will still need some interpretation." The designation "Neutral text" that G uses is now generally abandoned as misleading and because this text is not now considered distinct from the "Alexandrine."

327r. J. P. SMITH (in *Biblica* 37 ['56] 508-509), while welcoming the study as an important contribution to textual criticism, points out some limitations: "The exposition of the evidence is valuable and clear, though perforce limited by the inevitable method of collation with TR. . . . The statistical summaries are useful, though of course liable to mislead the unwary. . . . The chapters giving the conclusions are clear and judicious." The synoptical table of general conclusions, however, can only be correctly evaluated by reference to the more detailed conclusions that evaluate the data for each Gospel. The exposition of the evidence may serve as a basis for further work.

328r. H. G. MEECHAM (in *ExpT* 67 ['55] 44-45) concludes that this "thorough investigation considerably advances our knowledge of the Caesarean text and points the way to its further and wider exploration."

329r. M.-E. BOISMARD (in *RB* 63 ['56] 457-458) alone strikes a discordant note in this symphony of praise. He recognizes the value of the wealth of data that G has gathered. However, the general conclusions drawn from the data are to a great extent invalidated by G's assumption that the Western text is practically identical with codex D, neglecting the Old Latin, Tatian, and the Old Syriac too, for the most part. In the case of Jn, B finds that while a large

number of variants common to Cyril and the Caesarean witnesses also occur in the Latin, Tatian, and Chrysostom, other variants that G either designates as peculiar to Cyril or else fails to notice are likewise attested by one or other of these Western witnesses. Therefore, Cyril's text seems closer to the Western than the Caesarean.

330r. J. LEVIE (in *NRT* 78 ['56] 869) synthesizes the book without personal comment.

BOOK (331r-336r):

Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 1914-1939, by Bruce M. Metzger (Foreword by E. C. Colwell). Studies and Documents, ed. Silva Lake and Carsten Hoeg, Vol. 16, (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955). Pp. xviii & 133. In Octavo -24 Kr.

This exhaustive bibliography of nearly 1200 titles of books, monographs, studies, dissertations and articles dealing with textual criticism of the NT covers the years 1914 through 1939. Coverage includes about 250 periodicals and serials in all important Occidental languages (except Russian), with brief comments and notes on many of the items listed. Appended is an index of authors. Separate chapters treat handbooks of textual criticism, Greek manuscripts, versions, Church Fathers, Tatian's *Diatessaron* and medieval harmonies of the Gospels, families of texts, textual criticism of specific passages, paleography, and *personalia*.

OPINION:

331r. E. F. SIEGMAN (in *CBQ* 17 ['55] 660-661) considers this comprehensive and conveniently disposed bibliography, painstakingly edited and attractively printed, of "inestimable inherent value," and says that it helps point up the great need to interest more young men in the work of textual criticism. The number preceding each entry makes possible exhaustive cross-referencing. There is no need, because of *Theologischer Jahresbericht* and *Theologische Rundschau*, to include materials published prior to 1914. Since 1939, pertinent materials may be found listed in the Chicago University bibliographies.

332r. VINCENT TAYLOR (in *ExpT* 67 ['55-'56] 72-73) quotes Professor Colwell's foreword with approval: the book ". . . is part of the foundation for the great task of textual critics in the rewriting of the history of the text and the re-creation of theory." Valuable quotations are given from works not readily available to the ordinary student. For example, the views of T. Ayuso are summarized on the distinction between pre-Caesarean and Caesarean texts.

333r. M.-E. BOISMARD (in *RB* 63 ['56] 456) thinks that this tremendous work will save precious time for many scholars. For the period covered, it is an indispensable tool. Some of the works cited, B observes, have been re-edited and revised since 1939.

334r. ALLEN WIKGREN (in *JR* 36 ['56] 201) praises the immense amount of careful work which has gone into the compilation of this full and very useful bibliography. It offers helpful comments on many items. Annotation would be useful where revised editions of works, subsequent to the 1939 date, are known.

335r. JACOB GEERLINGS (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 245) thinks NT textual criticism will find this an indispensable handbook. But he feels that the usefulness of the appendix could have been increased by adding the names mentioned in the titles.

336r. J. LEVIE (in *NRT* 78 ['56] 868) says the book is a tool of highest value and pays special tribute to the care and thoroughness with which chapter 7 on "Specific Texts of the Gospels" was prepared.

NT THEOLOGY: LOVE AND CONSCIENCE

BOOK (337r-339r) :

C. SPICQ, O.P., *Agapè: Prolégomènes à une étude de théologie néo-testamentaire*. *Studia hellenistica*, No. 10. (Louvain: E. Nauwelaerts, and Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955). Pp. xii, 227. 175 Bel. Fr.

This work is an introduction to an extensive study of the word *agape* in the New Testament. The style is lexicographical and consists in an investigation of this word in relation to its synonyms, *stergo*, *erao*, and *phileo*; and of its background in classical Greek, in LXX, and in Judaism. It contains indices of French, Greek, Hebrew, and Latin terms and one of NT references.

OPINION:

337r. K. STENDAHL (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 64-65) finds that Spicq's method, as compared with earlier studies, is not revolutionary, but has great value in the number of nuances it explains. Against the common view of *agapao* as a "harmless" word, he finds it to have a distinctive character. The treatment of *'aheb* and *agapao* in the OT and in the documents of Judaism suggest the limitation of the lexicographical approach. The treatment of intertestamental material suffered from this approach also. Studies like S's are deeply affected by the understanding of differences in address and "creative milieu." S's book is a bibliographical mine. He has proved with brilliance and skill that Kittel's *Wörterbuch* is no substitute for first-hand contact with the background of biblical terminology.

338r. M.-E. BOISMARD (in *RB* 63 ['56] 469-470) thinks that biblical scholars will perhaps not find many new insights into the OT concept of charity, but they will be happy to find an impressive number of profane texts which will give them a better understanding of the origin of the Christian notion of love. Especially noteworthy is the excellent development of the notion of friendship in Aristotle. The documentation is abundant, precise, clear, and used with competence.

339r. H. H. ROWLEY (in *ExpT* 67 ['56] 220-221) commends the book as a learned and valuable study. Careful study of the evidence here collected will justify more cautious statements than are sometimes made. Although the view that *agape* expresses a spiritual love is not uncommon, it should be noted that it is used in various passages in the OT to express an emotional sentiment.

BOOK (340r-342r):

C. A. PIERCE, *Conscience in the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 15. (Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1955). Pp. 151. \$1.50.

This monograph is a "study of syneidesis in the NT; in the light of its sources, and with particular reference to St. Paul: with some observations regarding its pastoral relevance today." The book contains an analytic index to all usages found in Greek sources and an index to biblical references.

OPINION:

340r. JOSEPH GRASSI (in *CBQ* 18 ['56] 106-107) says that the author has presented a valuable contribution to biblical studies. P regards it as certain that the NT writers took over *syneidesis* from the Greek world without transforming it. This, however, is open to debate. Even if conscience has undergone more than a mere addition and completion in the NT, his conclusions regarding the misuse of the modern word, conscience, as a common sense guide to action whether present or future, remain valid.

341r. D. E. H. WHITELEY (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 117-118) notes that in explaining 1 Cor 8:10, the author does well to stress the fact that the dominant meaning of *syneidesis* is remorse. The rendering in 1 Pt 2:9, "an awareness of God shared with fellow Christians," is most attractive, although it involves a widening of the term *syneidesis*. The chapters dealing with conscience in the modern world concern a subject which really needs separate study. The author has made a concise and valuable contribution to his subject.

342r. C. E. FAW (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 65-66) admits that, although his procedure within chapters is frequently circuitous, his style heavy and lacking in lucidity, the general progress of the author's thought is well marked and his factual evidence and logic cumulative. As a scholar he has made an invaluable contribution to our knowledge of this important Christian concept. It would seem, however, that as a churchman Pierce is inclined to impose his linguistic strictures too rigidly upon modern thought, steadfastly insisting upon regarding conscience today as a completely subordinate "last resort," negative and individualistic faculty.

THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

BOOK (343r-345r):

L. Vaganay, *Le Problème Synoptique*. (Paris & Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1954). Pp. xxii and 474.

Cf. also "Autour de la question Synoptique," *ETL* 31 ('55) 343-356. (NTA May 1956 no. 44).

This book presents a new (and now well known) solution to the Synoptic problem. In brief: the Aramaic Matthew (attested to in the tradition which rests on Papias) is postulated as the original Synoptic source, along with a lost document, "S." Mark depends on this original Matthew, as do the present Greek Matthew and Luke, though they both depend on Mark, as well. The article in *ETL* is in rebuttal to J. Levie's detailed criticism in *NRT* (74 ['54] 688-715 and 812-843), "L'Évangile araméen de S. Matthieu est-il source de l'évangile de S. Marc?"

OPINION:

343r. L. G. FONSECA (in *Biblica* 37 ['56] 349-360) writes a long review of V's theory, examines it in great detail, praises the industry and scholarship displayed, yet doubts that it says the final word.

344r. AUSTIN FARRER (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 105-107) examines V's theory as well as Levie's attack. He finds Levie has the better of the argument, but feels V's book is quite valuable since his work "contains excellent incidental observations." This is not the perdition of faint praise, for "few of us read a treatise on *Le Problème Synoptique* with any idea of buying the grand synthesis." F finds V almost convincing in his argument that Luke depends on an older version of Mt.

345r. PAUL E. DAVIS (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 66-68) gives a long synopsis of V. Generally speaking, he remains non-committal, but feels "this vigorous treatment . . . will force NT scholars to wake up and rethink their own positions."

BOOK (346r-347r):

AUSTIN FARRER, *St. Matthew and St. Mark*. The Edward Cadbury Lectures 1953-54. (Westminster: Dacre Press, A. and C. Black Ltd., 1954).

F, seeking a principle of arrangement in St. Mark's Gospel, is sure that there is "a master symbolism unifying the narrative basis of the Gospel." Mark has arranged his material in accordance with a number of patterns, some numerical, some prefigurative. For instance, twelve, the number of the tribes of Israel, is a key figure. F applies it successively to the apostles, to Christ's miracles, to the loaves which were multiplied, etc. There are a half dozen similar themes in the book.

OPINION:

346r. C. K. BARRETT (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 107) is quite definite in his disagreement with F's thesis. His strongest objection is to the "improbabilities and special pleading which strain the credulity of the reader of this book." B feels that F has had recourse to "doubtful expedients" to prove his arguments. The apocalyptic use of numerical symbolism seems highly exaggerated to B, and he wonders why the key to Mark's Gospel would have been immediately lost until suddenly discovered by F centuries later.

347r. F. W. BEARE (in *JR* 35 ['55] 254) states that F has indicated new lines of research which give promise of fruitfulness, but that the validity of his conclusions remains to be tested by further study.

ATLAS, LEXICON, HISTORY

BOOK (348r-352r):

L. H. GROLLENBERG, *Atlas van de Bijbel*, in cooperation with A. van Deursen. (Amsterdam-Brussels: Elsevier, 1954). *Atlas de la Bible*. Translated and adapted by R. Beaupère, with preface by R. de Vaux, 2nd edit., (Paris-Brussels: Elsevier, 1955). *Atlas of the Bible*. Translated and edited by M. H. Reid and H. H. Rowley. (London: Nelson, 1956). 70s.

OPINION:

348r. R. TORBET (in *Blackfriars*, 37 ['56] 491-492) praises the archaeological and topographical photographs, especially the aerial views. The text "is astonishingly successful in combining a sober critical appraisal of the results of modern scholarship with a refreshingly clear exposition of the theological meaning of the Bible as a whole."

349r. H. VAN DEN BUSSCHE (in *ColBG* 4 ['54] 380-382) lists 17 misprints noted in the Dutch edition and makes a few criticisms pertaining to the OT. He has high praise for the work as a whole.

350r. A. VINCENT (in *RScRel* 30 ['56] 283-284) praises especially the skill whereby maps, photographs, and text complement one another so perfectly in giving an accurate idea of the land and its history. The maps with red historical overprint, enable one to review at a glance the events of an entire period.

351r. V. PAVLOVSKY (in *VD* 33 ['55] 300-303) also singles out the maps for commendation. He lists a number of inaccuracies and possible improvements, all pertaining to the OT. Misprints in the French edition are noted.

352r. A. GELIN (in *AmiCl* 65 ['55] 428) picks the photographs as the outstanding feature of the book.

BOOK (353r-355r):

Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon. Kirchlich-theologisches Handwörterbuch unter Mitarbeit von R. Frick, H. H. Harms, W. Joest, H. Noack, K. D. Schmidt, G. F. Vicedom, H. D. Wendland, H. W. Wolff, Hrg. von H. Brunotte und O. Webber. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1955 ff.) Lfg. 1-7. Quarto 640 Kol. Je Lfg. 4.80 DM.

The first seven sections ("A und O" through "Deutschland") of this new contribution to the sphere of religious encyclopedias give evidence that the completed three-volume work will be a splendid source for general information on Protestantism, and especially Lutheranism. Its approximately 16,000 key-words will give moderately full coverage on a wide range of subjects, including the-

ology, controversy, law, history, liturgy, archeology, and missions, and will be of use to clergymen, teachers, students, publicists, as well as to all those interested in the work and life of modern Protestantism.

OPINION:

353r. C. MARTIN (in *NRT* 77 ['55] 996-997 on Lief. 1-5. and *NRT* 78 ['56] 214 on Lief. 6-7) believes that, though works like the *Realenszyklopädie* and *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* will remain indispensable, this lexicon will bring the older encyclopedias up to date and complement them. Objectivity and accuracy in the articles are praiseworthy, especially with reference to treatment of Catholic positions on theology and practice. The bibliography is generally up to date, but shows some lacunae in foreign literature. The work is of primary interest to Protestants, especially Lutherans, but is recommended to Catholic scientific institutions and faculties of theology, and to specialists on Protestantism.

354r. BACHT (in *Scholastik* 31 ['56] 282 on Lfg. 1) thinks that the lexicon gives a "first answer" to all questions. Borrowing from older encyclopedias avoids unnecessary double-handling of some topics. The appearance in sections makes purchase easier for students and gives the reader some information on topics that will be treated more fully in later sections. Open-minded treatment of matters Catholic—especially the article on indulgences—and rich use of Catholic literature is commendable. The whole tone of the work is an evidence of the growing tendency toward unity among the various Protestant churches.

355r. P. NOBER (in *Biblica* 37 ['56] 381-383. on Lfg. 1-5) calls it a worthy counterpart to the *Biblisch-Theologische Wörterbuch zur Lutherbibel* and the *Evangelische Soziallexikon*. A pleasing arrangement of material features the inclusion of "framework" articles that allow for greater concentration of facts and persons. The reporting of Catholic questions is, on the whole, remarkably accurate; and particular praise is due the articles of K. E. Skydsgaard. Some exceptions to this virtue of the encyclopedia, however, are indicated: the article by K. Stürmer on apologetics, the treatment of Christ's knowledge of the Palestinian canon of Scripture, and the treatment of early Christian honor paid to images. The bibliography, also, shows lacunae, not only in respect to Catholic works.

BOOK (356r-358r):

WERNER FOERSTER, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, v. I, Das Judentum Palastinas zur Zeit Jesu und der Apostel*, 2nd ed. (Hamburg: Furche-Verlag, 1955). 248 pp. DM 12.80.

This study is the twenty-sixth of a series on the earliest Christian message (*Die urchristliche Botschaft*) and the first (of two) volumes on the history of the NT epoch. It deals with Palestinian Judaism in the period of the NT. F clearly explains the points of similarity between Judaism and NT customs,

while he notes that the attitude of the people towards Jesus Himself, the king of the people, accounts for the singular position of Christianity in Palestine. The book is divided into three main chapters. (1) The historical events from the Babylonian Exile up to the fall of Jerusalem. (2) The political, social, cultural, and economic conditions of Palestine in the time of Jesus. (3) The Jewish religion itself and in some of its main sects (Sadducees, Zealots, Essenes, and Pharisees).

OPINION:

356r. S. VERNON McCASLAND (in *JBL* 75 ['56] 58) praises F's second edition especially for the incorporation of recent discoveries and publications affecting the history under discussion. McC notes the difficulty of separating Palestinian from Hellenic Judaism, since Palestine had many traces of Hellenic culture at the time of Christ.

357r. DAVID DAUBE (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 101) calls the style "lucid and attractive, and the scholarship impeccable and up to date." D admires the treatment of the rabbinic background, and especially of the complexity of rabbinic theology. D finds that the minor flaws concerning Hellenic influence and the Passover liturgy do not detract from F's achievement.

358r. M.-E. BOISMARD (in *RB* 63 ['56] 475) notes the improvement in this second edition, especially in the second chapter of the book, amplified to serve as a general introduction to the forthcoming second volume (on the Hellenic world of NT times). B finds the incorporation of the Qumran findings most enlightening on the doctrine of the Essenes. A new appendix contains valuable material for further study on the Jewish religion at the time of Christ, indicating recent scholarly publications on this subject.

SENSUS PLENIOR

BOOK (359r-362r):

R. E. BROWN, *The Sensus Plenior of Sacred Scripture*. (Baltimore: St. Mary's University [Roland Park], 1955). Pp. xiv-161. \$2.00 (Postpaid).

This doctoral dissertation treats a difficult, primary, and moot question in theology. The first two chapters present the background of the problem. The first chapter treats the various senses of scripture, the literal, typical, consequent, and accommodated. Chapter two is a brief history of exegesis. The third chapter highlights the exegetical problems which *sensus plenior* is intended to meet. The final chapter presents the definition, division, and examples of the fuller sense and answers the objections against it. The work concludes with a list of over twenty definitions of *sensus plenior* offered by recent writers and a selective bibliography.

OPINION:

359r. F. L. MORIARTY (in *TS* 16 ['55] 398-399) thinks Brown has presented an objective and complete study of the fuller sense which will help to bring

order to the debate on it. He has distinguished clearly the various senses of Scripture, briefly chronicled the history of Jewish and Christian exegesis, and in the best chapter explained and defended the fuller sense.

360r. J. A. O'FLYNN (in *IrTQ* 22 ['55] 275-276) praises the logical arrangement of the work, the painstaking elucidation of the various themes which come up for analysis, and the moderation with which the conclusions are put forward. He thinks it provides a useful general review of the problem and of the arguments on both sides.

361r. R. E. MURPHY (in *CBQ* 17 ['55] 502-505) finds B's study solid, judicious, and a real contribution to a difficult theological problem. It is invaluable for its bibliography and rich footnotes. The authoritative and theoretical aspect of the fuller sense is established. The task remains to work it out in actual exegesis, for M disagrees with some examples of such exegesis as proposed by B.

362r. J. M. T. BARTON (in *JTS* 7 ['56] 294-295) notes that this is the first attempt to strike a balance between the opinions of the friends and enemies of the fuller sense. Brown should be praised for his fairness to his opponents, his real perception of the issues, and his readiness to make full use of his authorities (while not being in bondage to them); but there is need for more exegetical evidence than he has been able to give in this work.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

BONSIRVEN—Joseph Paul Bonsirven, S.J., was born in Lavaur in the province of Tarn, France, in January, 1880. Having studied at St. Sulpice at Toulouse, and at Rome, he was ordained in 1903. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1919, and was assigned to the Catholic Institute of Toulouse. Later, he taught in the Scholasticates of Fourvière and Enghein. At present, he holds the chair of New Testament Exegesis at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome. He devoted himself to the study of Judaism, both ancient and modern, and is an authority on Talmudic and Jewish questions. He has published on St. John and St. Paul, and has contributed heavily to reviews and encyclopedias.

BULTMANN—Rudolf Karl Bultmann, Lutheran theologian, was born in Wiefelstede, Germany, on August 20, 1884. He was Professor of Theology at the University of Marburg for 34 years, with brief periods also at the Universities of Breslau and Giessen. He retired in 1951. A specialist in early Church history and exegesis, he was one of the founders of the school of form-criticism in biblical study. His work, *The New Testament and Mythology* (1941), started a lively controversy, still continuing, on "demythologizing" the New Testament narratives to adapt them to the modern mind. This theory is discussed in several articles abstracted in our previous and present issues.

CULLMANN—Oscar Cullmann, French Lutheran theologian, was born in Strasbourg, Germany, in 1902. He began his career in 1925 as a teacher of Greek and German, and in the following year he became the Director of the Protestant Seminar in Strasbourg. Between 1927 and 1938 he held successively the positions of Lecturer in New Testament Greek, Professor of New Testament, and Professor of Early Church History, all at the University of Strasbourg. At present, he is Professor of New Testament and Early Church History at the University of Basel, Switzerland (since 1938), and Professor of the Study of Early Christianity at the Sorbonne, Paris (since 1949). He is a prominent author on eschatology, exegesis, primitive Christianity, and the origins of the Papacy.

DODD—Charles Harold Dodd, Anglican minister and theologian, was born in Wrezham, North Wales, on April 7, 1884. At different periods between 1915 and 1949, he was professor of various biblical subjects at the Universities of Oxford, Manchester, and Cambridge, and at Union Theological Seminary, New York. Since 1950, he has been General Director of the New Translation of the Bible. He has lectured at Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and at several other universities and seminaries of the Eastern United States. Since 1916, his numerous publications have been nearly exclusively on New Testament theology and exegesis.

VACCARI—Alberto Vaccari, S.J., orientalist and biblical scholar, was born in Bastido dei Dossi, near Pavia, Italy, on March 4, 1875. He began his scholarly career as a professor of classical languages. Since 1912, he has been Professor of Exegesis at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome. From 1929 to 1953, he was the director of the periodical *Verbum Domini*. In 1942, he published an Italian translation of the Bible from original texts. He has written widely on the Early Church Fathers, as well as on the books of both the Old and the New Testament.

VINCENT—Louis Hugues Vincent, O.P., was born on August 31, 1872, at St. Alban-de-Vorèze in the province of Isère, France. He entered the Dominican Order in 1890 at Ryckolt, Holland, and was ordained in 1895. He was assigned to the École Biblique in Jerusalem, working under Père Lagrange. Since 1896 he has contributed to journals, especially to *Revue Biblique*, frequent articles on historical, topographical, geological, and archaeological subjects. Some of his most valuable contributions are his reports, maps, diagrams, etc., on Emmaus, Jericho, and the walls of Jerusalem.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bouyer, Louis. *Le quatrième évangile. Introduction à l'évangile de Jean, traduction et commentaire*. 3^e édition. "Bible et Vie Chrétienne." (Tournai-Paris: Casterman. Editions de Maredsons, Belgique, 1956). 239 pp. (no price given).

Daniel-Rops. *The Book of Life. The Story of the New Testament*. (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1956). 154 pp. \$3.75.

Heinisch, Paul. *Christ in Prophecy*. Translated by William Heidt, O.S.B. (St. Paul, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1956). 279 pp. \$6.00.

Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete. Editor F. Stier. III. 1954-1955. Heft 1-2. (Dusseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1956). xii and 232 pp. DM 34.

Of volume II, Heft 1-2 Professor H. H. Rowley (*Book List*, 1956) said, "It contains the titles of 1,547 articles bearing on the Bible, which have appeared in the 393 periodicals under survey. Almost every entry contains a summary of the articles concerned. An international team of more than fifty scholars has co-operated in its preparation, and their service to scholarship is beyond all praise. The entries are classified according to subject, and there is an author index. No one who is interested in research on any Biblical subject can afford to neglect this tool."

Murphy, Roland E. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*. (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1956). 116 pp. \$1.50.

Proceedings: Second Annual Meeting of the Society of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine (University of Notre Dame, April 2-3 1956). (Washington: Dunbarton College of Holy Cross, 1956). 131 pp.

Chalmer E. Faw, "The Heart of the Gospel of Mark," *JBR* 24 ('56) 77-82.

J. Philip Hyatt, "The View of Man in the Qumran 'Hodayot,'" *NTS* 2 ('56) 276-284.

———, "Yahweh as 'The God of My Father,'" *VetT* 5 ('55) 130-136.

NEW ABSTRACTORS

The following scholars have agreed to cover publications for NTA: J. Bligh (Rome), J. Blinzler (Passau), R. Bürck (Trichinopoly, India), M. J. Dahood (Rome), J. Dalton (Pymble, N.S.W.), L. Johnston (Ushaw, Durham), I. Mausolf (Marathon, Wis.), F. J. McCool (Woodstock, Md. and Rome), R. North (Jerusalem), V. T. O'Keefe (Woodstock, Md.), H. Willmering (St. Marys, Kans.). J.-L. D'Aragon (Montreal) has been directing some of his students in the making of abstracts. A. Jones (Upholland, Lancs.) and J. L. McKenzie (West Baden, Ind.) have organized similar groups.

PUBLICATIONS OF WESTON COLLEGE PRESS

A. C. Cotter, S.J. *Theologia Fundamentalis*. 2nd edition. 1947. 737 pages. \$6.00.

———. *The Encyclical "Humani Generis" with a Commentary*. 2nd edition, 1952. 114 pages. \$1.00.

———. *ABC of Scholastic Philosophy*. 4th printing. 434 pages. Cloth Bound \$3.25. Paper Bound \$2.50.

———. *Natural Species*. 274 pages. \$2.00.

Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J. *Foreword to the Old Testament Books*. 118 pages. \$1.00.

John C. Ford, S.J. *Depth Psychology, Morality and Alcoholism*. 88 pages. \$1.00.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE TEXTS

Mt 1:18-25	204	Lk 5:1-11	294r	Acts 24:26	217
Mt 1:18-2:12	235	Lk 6:13	182	Acts 26:12-19	210
Mt 4:5	175	Lk 8:2	206	Acts 28:30-31	217
Mt 5:8	234	Lk 9:51-18:14	296r	Rom 5:12	215
Mt 5:27	234	Lk 10:30ff	233	Rom 16:19	264
Mt 5:38	233	Lk 11:39	234	1 Cor 1:2-9	220
Mt 5:39-40	180	Lk 11:41	234	1 Cor 2:8	223
Mt 6:1-6	234	Lk 12:10	228	1 Cor 5:5-7	294r
Mt 6:22	234	Lk 18:9	234	1 Cor 7:36-38	215
Mt 7:3	233	Lk 21-24	192	1 Cor 8:10	341r
Mt 7:12	233	Lk 22:7	184	1 Cor 11:24	184
Mt 11:14	207	Lk 22:57	189	1 Cor 15	264
Mt 12:7	233	Lk 22:60	189	1 Cor 15:4-5	294r
Mt 12:31-32	228	Lk 24:13-35	294r	1 Cor 15:29	222
Mt 14:20	281	Lk 24:34	294r	2 Cor 5:1-10	224
Mt 15:18	234	Jn 1-14	177	Gal 1:15-17	210
Mt 16:16	174	Jn 1:1-14	177	Gal 2:1ff	225
Mt 17:11-13	207	Jn 1:3	197	Gal 2-4	238
Mt 18:15	233	Jn 1:12-13	206	Gal 4:4	206
Mt 19:4	281	Jn 4:1-12	193	Gal 6:13	219
Mt 19:9	234	Jn 5:4	177	Phil 2:6-11	213
Mt 22:15-46	281	Jn 6	194	Col 1:15-20	213
Mt 23:9	313r	Jn 6:16-20	294r	1 Tm 1:17	227
Mt 25:22ff	264	Jn 7:2	237	1 Tm 3:16	213, 235
Mt 25:35	233	Jn 7-8	237	2 Tm 1:10	227
Mt 26:38,45	281	Jn 7:41-42	206	2 Tm 1:17	217
Mt 28:8-10	294r	Jn 7:53-8:11	177, 181	2 Tm 4:16	217
Mt 28:16-20	294r	Jn 8:41	206	Ti 2:11	235
Mt 28:16	221	Jn 9:29	206	Ti 3:4	235
Mk 3:22-30	228	Jn 13:10	234	Heb 7:3	206
Mk 6:3	206	Jn 15:3	234	Heb 10:5-7	235
Mk 7:20	234	Jn 15:13	233	Heb 10:19	258
Mk 8:38	188	Jn 18:28	257	1 Pt 2:4-9	258
Mk 11:25	314r	Jn 18:32	181	1 Pt 2:5-4	258
Mk 12:17	234	Jn 19:25-27	201	1 Pt 2:9	341r
Mk 12:28	233	Jn 19:36	281	1 Pt 2:49	258
Mk 13	314r	Jn 20:19-21	294r	2 Pt 1:16	250
Mk 13:9-11	304r	Jn 20:30	195	1 Jn 3,4	230
Mk 13:26	188	Jn 21:1-14	294r	Ap 1:6	258
Mk 14:12	184	Acts 2:36	211	Ap 12	201, 235
Mk 14:55-65	181	Acts 3:18	211	Ap 20:6	258
Mk 14:62	188	Acts 6:8-7:60	181	Ap 21-22	237
Mk 14:68	189	Acts 10	225		
Lk 1-2	191, 192	Acts 11:30	225		
Lk 1:26-38	204	Acts 12:25	225		
Lk 1:26-56	235	Acts 14:10-11	209		
Lk 1:34-35	202, 206	Acts 18	209		
Lk 1:35	281	Acts 21:8-9	206		
Lk 2:1-20	235	Acts 22:1-21	210		

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

Author	Entry	Author	Entry
Adamantius	197	Cushman, R.	236
Agrippa	181	Cyril of Jerusalem, St.	324r-330r
Alexander Jannaeus	269, 275, 278	Dahl, N.	185
Alford	221	Dalman,	221
Alianello, C.	200	Daniélou, J.	237
Allegro, J.	266, 268, 275, 283r-292r	Danker, F.	238
Ambrose, St.	197	Daube, D.	281, 357r
Antiochus Epiphanes	275	Davis, P.	345r
Argyle, A.	180	de Koninck, C.	199
Aristotle	338r	de la Potterie, I.	230
Arndt, W.	225	Demetrius I	275
Athanasius, St.	246	Descartes	236
Audet, J.-P.	203	de Vaux, R.	266, 283r, 292r, 348r-352r
Aulen, G.	245, 246	De Zwaan, J.	209
Ayuso, T.	332r	Dibelius, M.	212
Bacht, H.	354r	Diehl, E.	264
Baillet, M.	265	Dix, G.	235
Barrera, L.	213	Dodd, C.	185, 193, 212, 294r-295r, 309r, 311r
Barrett, C.	193, 346r	Dodds, E.	209
Barth, K.	206, 236, 246	Donnelly, P.	204
Barthélemy, D.	272, 276	Draper, H.	180
Barton, J.	362r	Dulles, A.	239
Bauer, G.	193	Du Manoir,	199
Bea, A.	232	Duplacy, J.	255
Beare, F.	347r	Dupont, J.	182, 299r
Beasley-Murray, G.	315r-318r	Dupont-Sommer, A.	267, 273, 275
Beaucamp, E.	220	Euripides	209
Beaupère, R.	348r-352r	Eusebius	324r
Benoit, P.	174, 215, 257	Euthalius	178
Birnbaum, S.	263	Evagrius	178
Bishop, E.	221	Evans, C.	296r-297r
Black, M.	189, 320r	Fahy, T.	207
Boismard, M.-E.	254, 316r, 321r, 329r, 333r, 338r, 358r	Farrer, A.	298r-299r, 344r, 346r-347r
Bonsirven, J.	213, 233, 234	Faw, C.	342r
Bouyer, L.	193, 200	Fenton, J.	300r-301r
Bover,	213	Fernandez, P.	200
Boyd, W.	189	Feuillet, A.	224
Boyer, D.	214	Fitzmeyer, J.	287r
Bratcher, R.	190	Flanagan, N.	202
Braun, F.	193, 199, 200, 201	Foerster, W.	356r-358r
Braun, M.	279	Fonseca, L.	343r
Brockington, L.	293r	Franzelin, J.	174
Brown, R.	193, 290r, 359r-362r	Frick, R.	353r-355r
Brownlee, W.	271, 276	Fridrischen, A.	244
Brunner, E.	206	Fuller, R.	179
Brunotte, H.	353r-355r	Gächter, P.	202
Bruns, J. E.	280	Gallus, T.	199
Buchanan, G.	187	Gärtner, B.	212
Bultmann, R.	245, 246	Geerlings, J.	335r
Burkill, T.	181	Gelin, A.	352r
Burrows, M.	276, 283r-292r	George, A.	231
Butler, C.	295r, 299r, 305r, 306r, 308r, 310r, 314r	Gesenius	271
Cabaniss, A.	235	Giblet, S.	200
Cadbury, E.	346r-347r	Grant,	176
Cadbury, H.	209	Grassi, J.	340r
Cajetan	202	Graystone, G.	193, 268, 283r-292r
Caligula	181	Green, H.	193
Cambier, J.	193	Greenlee, J.	324r-330r
Carrington, P.	237	Griffiths, D.	193
Cerfaux, L.	185, 193, 213, 299r	Grollenberg, L.	348r-352r
Chadwick, H.	176	Guardini, R.	199
Charlier, C.	193, 200	Guthrie, D.	226
Chrysostom, St. John	329r	Haberman, A.	269
Clermont-Ganneau,	181	Hagkett, J.	209
Collins, J.	215, 285r	Harms, H.	353r-355r
Colwell, E.	331r-332r	Harnack, A.	195, 244
Conybeare,	178	Haroutunian, J.	240
Coppens, J.	174, 216	Haugg,	202
Corish, P.	259	Hempel, J.	277
Craig, C.	221		
Cullmann, O.	193, 219, 244		

Author	Entry
Henry, P.	174
Henson, B.	208
Hoeg, C.	324r, 331r
Hohenstein, H.	228
Holl,	244
Ignatius of Antioch, St.	235
Jaubert, A.	184, 237
Jeremias, J.	181
Jerome, St.	179, 261
Joest, W.	353r-355r
John Hyrcanus I	278
Johnson, L.	217
Johnson, S.	295r, 297r, 299r, 306r
Johnston, L.	241, 291r
Jones, A.	242, 270
Jones, C.	302r-303r
Jones, G.	243
Josephus	181, 198, 267, 279, 282
Jugie, M.	199
Jouon, P.	271
Juster,	181
Kattenbusch,	244
Kilpatrick, G.	181, 304r-305r
Kittel, G.	337r
Klausner, J.	280
Knott, B.	264
Knox, W.	185
Kredel, E.	244
Kuemmell, F.	215
Kuss, O.	218
Lagrange, M.-J.	200
Lake, K.	212
Lake, S.	324r, 313r
Lampe, G.	305r-306r
Landersdorfer, S.	202
Lanne, D.	219
La Sor, W.	271
Laurentin, R.	191, 199
Leaney, R.	176
Le Frois, B.	201
Leo XIII, Pope	174
Léon-Dufour, F.	185
Levie, J.	185, 330r, 336r, 342r, 344r
Lightfoot, R.	293r
Ling, T.	223
Luther, M.	225
Lyonnet, S.	215
Mackinnon, D.	307r-308r
Macquarrie, J.	245, 246
Maldfeld, G.	177
Manson, T.	212, 309r-310r
Marchand, J.	178
Martin, C.	353r
Martin, V.	177
May, E.	317r
McCarland, S.	356r
McCool F.	185
Meecham, H.	328r
Mehlman, J.	197
Mercurio, R.	285r
Metzger, B.	319r, 331r-336r
Michel, A.	247
Michl, J.	261
Milik, J.	272
Mitton, C.	226
Mohrmann, C.	248
Mollat, D.	193
Moriarty, F.	286r, 288r, 359r
Moule, C.	297r, 305r, 312r
Mowry, L.	193
Munck, J.	215, 219
Murphy, R.	290r, 292r, 361r

Author	Entry
Neil, W.	183
Nineham, D.	293r, 311r-312r, 315r
Noack, H.	353r-355r
Nober, P.	355r
Norden, E.	209
North, R.	272
Oesterreicher, J.	273
O'Flynn, J.	360r
Oke, C.	227
Ordenez, V.	258
Origen	176, 179, 324r
O'Rourke, J.	249
Owens, G.	205
Pamphilus	178
Papias	342r
Parker,	299r
Paulinus	261
Pavlovsky, V.	351r
Ferkins, J.	259, 260
Philo Judaeus	181, 282
Pierce, C.	340r-342r
Plagnieux, J.	199
Plummer, A.	221
Porter, J.	212
Prat, F.	200, 213, 216
Prentice, W.	210
Quirinius	206
Radius, E.	200
Raeder, M.	222
Rahner, K.	175
Ramsay,	212
Reicke, B.	212
Reid, M.	348r-352r
Reimarus, S.	244
Roberts, C.	262
Robertson, E.	221
Robinson, E.	178
Robinson, J. A. T.	188, 211
Romeo, A.	200
Roth, C.	282
Rowley, H.	274, 275, 339r, 348r-352r
Rubinstein, A.	276
Sanders, J.	195
Saturninus	206
Schierse, F.	295r, 297r, 301r, 303r, 308r, 310r, 314r, 318r
Schleiermacher, F.	236, 244
Schlier, H.	250
Schmid, H.	185
Schmidt, K.	353r-355r
Schmitt, J.	193
Schonfield, H.	284r, 291r
Schürer,	180
Schweitzer, A.	195, 309r
Segal	269
Siegmán, E.	325r, 331r
Siricius, Pope	205
Skydsgaard, K.	355r
Smith, J.	327r
Smothers, E.	260
Soden, W. von	178
Sohm, R.	244
Spadafora, F.	200
Spiazzi, R.	251
Stanley, D.	186, 193
Stegemann, H.	277
Stendahl, K.	337r
Snicq, C.	337r-339r
Stürmer, K.	355r
Sukenik, E.	277
Swete	221

Author	Entry
Tasker, R.	324r
Tatian	323r, 329r, 331r
Taylor, V.	185, 192, 206, 322r, 332r
Telesphorus, Pope	235
Tertullian	206, 226
Thyes, A.	200
Tillich, P.	236, 239
Toombs, L.	278
Torbet, R.	348r
Torrance, T.	252
Toynbee, J.	259, 260
Trémel, Y.	256
Turner, H.	206
Twomey, J.	198
Vaganay, L.	185, 299r, 343r-345r
Van den Bussche, H.	196, 349r
van Deusen, A.	348r-352r
van Unnik, W.	229
Vespasian	279
Vicedom, G.	353r-355r
Vincent, A.	350r

Author	Entry
Vogels, H.	323r
Vogt, E.	184
Vööbus, A.	319r-323r
Webber, O.	353r-355r
Weiss, J.	244
Wendland, H.	353r-355r
Whiteley, D.	341r
Wikgren, A.	326r, 334r
Willam, F.	200
Williams, C.	212
Wilson, E.	283r-288r
Winter, P.	192
Wolff, H.	353r-355r
Wrede,	309r
Wunderlich, L.	253
Young, F.	194
Zacagnius	178
Zeitlin, S.	269, 292r
Zerwick, M.	299r, 301r, 303r, 306r, 310r

